THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 1. APRIL, 1937. Vol. XXVII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Recall to Religion.

'An ounce of practice is worth a ton of theory' is a saying as applicable to Church affairs as to more mundane matters. Those who, in the interests of the Christian Religion in this land, desire the ending of the detrimental schisms between the Free Churches and ourselves will welcome the line of action so judiciously initiated by the Vicar of Harborne, and described in the following letter to the *Birmingham Post* of March 24:

> Sir,—I wonder if you would care to give publicity to the United Service of Holy Communion with members of the Free Churches which is to be held in Harborne Parish Church on this Maundy Thursday night at 8 o'clock?
>
> It has been asked what the Diocese of Birmingham is doing in response to the Archbishop's recall to religion. This service — not held for the first time this year — is an answer to that question, in deed and not only in word. The answer is radical, but the Church is too far sunk in unreality — in self-righteousness and in lip service to the truth — for anything but radical measures to avail. And the fact that a United Communion Service, at which a Methodist minister will preach and both Methodist and Baptist ministers will administer the Chalice, should appear almost subversive is the measure of how unreal our Church life has become.
>
> On a former occasion when such a service was held in my church, a 'devout' member of the Church of England (but not in the Birmingham Diocese, I am glad to say) wrote to the Bishop of Birmingham and asked him to ban so un-Christian a proceeding. He replied, asking

what there could be that was un-Christian in a gathering of Christians together round the Table of their Lord on the tragic anniversary of the eve of His Crucifixion. He received back as his answer, written on a postcard, the one word 'Judas.' Is this really the view of the Church of England in general concerning intercommunion with our Free Churches? If it is, the Archbishop's recall will accomplish nothing; for, in face of the crying need for presenting to the world essential Christianity, mere interchange of pulpits, fraternity on platforms and hand-shaking round conference tables take on the appearance of superficiality and insincerity.

At the United Service of Communion in Harborne Parish Church this Maundy Thursday night the revised form of service printed in the 'Modern Churchman' of February this year will be used. The more sincere our discipleship, the more truthful should be our forms of prayer and praise.

What is there to hinder the Church of England from making a beginning of implementing her Christianity to the full by acknowledging the brotherhood of all other Churches whose members can unite in the simple confession that 'Jesus Christ is Lord'? I am convinced that nothing hinders but the lack of faith and courage.

R. D. RICHARDSON.

Some 200 communicants took part in this Maundy Thursday Service, and it is of especial interest to note that the Easter Day celebrations at Harborne were attended this year by 200 more communicants than in former years.

The Primate's Recall to Religion has led many to ask: 'What ought I to do to assist the Recall?' The Modernist programme, which includes the simplification of our creeds and the modernization of our Public Worship, includes also the healing of our divisions with the Reformed Churches in this land, and we doubt if any better way could be found of healing these divisions than by promoting such services of intercommunion as those which have been initiated at Harborne. There is no need, however, for Modernists to wait until next Maundy Thursday before taking steps to achieve this Christian fellowship.

THE DILEMMA OF MODERNISM.

An article of exceptional interest to Modernists on the dilemma of Modernism by Dean Matthews appeared in the *Spectator* of March 19.

The Modernist's recurring dilemma is to harmonize Christian tradition with modern knowledge. In the nineteenth century his dilemma was to harmonize the claims of physical science with the affirmations of the Christian faith: after that his dilemma was

to harmonize the negative conclusions of historical research with the positive statements of the Christian creeds. But Dean Matthews is conscious of an additional dilemma for the Modernist at the present time. He asserts that there are two kinds of Christian Modernism in the field and these two kinds are in apparent conflict with one another.

The first is Liberal Protestantism, which is most adequately expounded in Harnack's really great and popular volume, *What is Christianity?* (*Das Wesen des Christentums*).

The second is Catholic Modernism, which originated with modern-minded historical and Biblical scholars in the Roman Church — pre-eminent among whom were Alfred Loisy and George Tyrrell, both of whom were excommunicated.

Liberal Protestantism is individualist, and does not recognize the Church as an essential element in the Christian religion. This may be illustrated by an experience related by the present Master of the Temple. Some years ago he found himself on a Sunday in a little restaurant on the Rhine. The other guests departed and he was waited on alone by the good woman who kept the restaurant. He said to her: In this busy Sunday life of yours you cannot find time to attend church. She replied: What does it matter? One carries one's religion here, and she laid her hand on her heart.

Catholic Modernism regards the Church as essential to the Christian Religion — indeed, for some such Modernists, the Church is all, and the Mass, the supreme act of its *cultus*, is as essential as the Church itself.

The Modernism of Liberal Protestantism was drastically criticized by Loisy in his book, *L'Evangile et l'Eglise* published in 1902. Catholic Modernism was subjected to a no less drastic criticism by Inge in 1904 in a sermon preached before the University of Oxford. Hence Dean Matthew's Modernist dilemma is no new one, but we doubt whether it is a serious one for English Churchmen, since there is a third kind of Modernism to which Dean Matthews does not specifically refer: it is neither German Modernism nor Latin Modernism, but English Modernism. The English Modernist has achieved, so it seems to us, the synthesis between Liberal Protestantism and Catholic Modernism, which synthesis Dean Matthews rightly regards as

so needful and so desirable. The English Modernist has achieved this because he is an English Churchman. As a consequence of his English Churchmanship he has come to recognize that the Christian Religion needs for the achievement of its mission the Christian Church. The English Modernist also recognizes the need for the continuity both of Christian Faith and Christian institutions, and he values highly the Christian Sacrament in Christian public worship.

> 'English Modernism, which aims at a synthesis of Liberalism and Catholicism . . . is entirely in harmony with the genius of the English Church.'

We stressed all this some ten years ago in *English Modernism*.[1]

There are differences in the Modernist camp. These concern mythology and Sacraments. Dean Matthews seems to refer to the former of them when he writes:

> 'The Liberal Protestant tends to become impatient with the Catholic Modernist when the latter . . . values mythological statements as vehicles of religious truth. The Catholic Modernist, on the other hand, is tempted to wonder whether his Protestant brother has sufficiently pondered the relation between religion and poetry.'

What separates Modernists in the sphere of mythology is not for instance whether the Fall Story and the Virgin Birth Narratives are mythoolgy. No Modernist resents this verdict, nor whether mythology has a use in the presentation of spiritual truth (all Modernists are agreed that it has): where perhaps Modernists disagree among themselves is whether the Modernist teacher should declare that that which is mythology is mythology or whether he should be silent or ambiguous on this point.

We hold that it is most important in an age of scientific education that Christian teachers should not give the impression that they believe myths to be historic facts and that the Church requires such a belief from her members to-day.

There is another difference in the Modernist camp. It concerns the liturgical use of Sacraments. In the pre-scientific age the Sacraments were viewed in Catholic circles as operating miraculously: to-day they are interpreted as working psychologically. Here we assume all English Modernists are agreed.

[1] Published by the Harvard University Press and Oxford University Press, 1927.

Where they differ is that some Modernists desire extreme liturgical simplicity : others desire elaborate symbolism and dramatic action.

But there need be no quarrel here provided that both types of Modernist agree that both ideals of Public Worship are legitimate in the Church of England and that, within the limits set by the Church authorities, the parishioners must have the right to determine the type of public worship in their parish churches. No doubt these differences in the Modernist camp would be all the better for being cleared up in a Modernist conference, but they are not serious enough to constitute a dilemma.

METHODS OF REUNION : SOUND AND UNSOUND.

This summer two great assemblies intended to advance the cause of Christian unity are being held in Great Britain : the Life and Work Conference at Oxford in July and the Faith and Order Conference at Edinburgh in August.

M. Zernov, a Russian lay theologian, contributes to the March issue of *Theology*, an article on Methods of Reunion. He takes the view that there are three main methods of reunion. First the 'Authoritarian' method which is used by each Church which assumes that it is absolutely right in its system and that all its dogmas are the absolute expressions of Divine truth. As these cannot be modified in any degree Christian reunion requires that all other Christian Churches or individuals who at present do not agree with the Church that maintains these rites and dogmas shall be brought to submit to them. When submission is duly made reunion is achieved. This method appears up to the present to have had little success to its credit.

Secondly, there is the method of 'a working compromise.' This method is adopted by all the Churches which are ready to admit that they do not possess the whole truth and that their ecclesiastical system is not a perfect system explicitly sanctioned by Divine authority. Both their theology, therefore, and their rites and organization admit of modification and adjustment in the interests of reunion. This method of 'a working compromise' promoted by numerous conferences has accomplished much. By it the divided Presbyterian Churches have been united : so also the divided Methodist Churches : it has brought

together into co-operative unity in Canada the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregationalist Churches. It has not yet achieved success in South India owing to Anglo-Catholic opposition which believes only in the first method of reunion.

The third method is the 'Eucharistic method.' This is the method ardently advocated by M. Zernov, although he confesses it has not yet had trial on an extensive scale. This 'Eucharistic method' does not consist, as some might suppose, in the practice of intercommunion, since in this method there is no common reception of the Eucharistic elements. By this 'Eucharistic method' the separated Christians worship together at the Eucharist but do not partake of it in common. This method of reunion demands as a preliminary for effectiveness that the 'Catholic belief in the Real Presence' shall be held by all those who take part in this service. The difficulty presented by this method lies in the fact that so many of those Christians whom it is desirable to re-unite do not hold and are never likely to hold the 'Catholic belief in the Real Presence,' and therefore can never be re-united by this method.

We are not quite sure what M. Zernov means precisely by the 'Catholic belief in the Real Presence.' Speaking theologically there are several doctrines of the Real Presence, but all of them are not dependent upon the presence of the Eucharistic elements. The most fundamental, primitive, and assuredly Christian form of this doctrine of the Real Presence is that promised in the words of Jesus Christ: 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them' (Mt. xviii, 20).

This gathering together in Christ's name may be at the service of Holy Communion or at some other gathering for Divine Worship in which the Holy Communion is not celebrated: or it may be the gathering together of Christians to carry out in accordance with the Divine Will activities which have for their object the advancement of the Kingdom of God among mankind. None of these gatherings demands as a preliminary a 'Catholic belief in the Real Presence.' They demand nothing except the will to worship together and to co-operate together in the name of Christ and that, as it seems to us, is the only sure basis for the accomplishment of Christian Reunion. In this

method we have the true Christian unity which may be combined with great diversity of theological beliefs and ecclesiastical organizations. But the Christian world, and pre-eminently the 'Catholic' portion of it, has a long way to go before it accepts this basis for Christian Reunion.

THE FUTURE OF ENGLISH CATHEDRALS.

An able article — somewhat in the style of Dean Swift — from the pen of Professor Norman Sykes dealing with our English cathedrals appears in the *Nineteenth Century* of April 1937.

It is not the history nor the architecture of our English Cathedrals that Dr. Sykes is concerned with but the changes which are taking place in the personnel of the cathedral clergy and in the use of the cathedrals in the service of the religion of the nation. Owing on the one hand to the diminishing revenues of the cathedrals and on the other hand to the practical needs of diocesan organization, the character of the cathedral clergy and of the cathedral services is undergoing serious changes.

The Reformation ideal for our cathedrals was twofold. The first aim was to make the cathedrals centres of sacred learning and particularly of Biblical studies, and also sources of powerful and eloquent exposition of religious truth enshrining and propagating the reformed principles of the English Church. The second aim was to make the cathedrals centres of sacred music both in practice and theory.

It is both these ideals which are at present in danger. The Deans and Chapters are rapidly ceasing to be bodies of learned men. Before the war there were a number of great scholars holding office in the cathedral bodies. To-day there are hardly any. Few indeed are the learned volumes of theological and Biblical studies produced by cathedral dignitaries: still fewer are the defences and expositions of the reformed principles of the Church of England which proceed from cathedral chapters.

The situation in regard to sacred music is less alarming, although some of the most discerning and zealous of our church musicians might be found to utter a more pessimistic note.

Dr. Sykes satirically suggests that our English cathedrals should be subjected to the treatment which the disestab-

lished Church of Wales has meted out to her cathedrals. The Welsh cathedrals have become magnified parish churches under episcopal control. Great financial advantages have accrued from this policy, but these are the only advantages apparent. The present English policy of filling as many of the cathedral stalls as possible with suffragan bishops, archdeacons, and diocesan missioners, whilst certainly making for the efficiency of diocesan organization, is being purchased at the cost of more solid gains. The surrender of the English clergy to the numinous irrationalism of Otto and to the mystical incomprehensibilities of Barth have led and are leading to the discrediting of sound learning as a valuable asset in Christian teaching.

Bishop Creighton, who saw in sound learning one of the most precious characteristics of the Church of England, might well turn in a grave over which are inscribed the words: He tried to write true history; for according to our contemporary Teutonised Anglicans the purpose of Christian teaching is not enlightenment, but the production of religious fervours and mystical sensations. Yet such is the character and temper of the English people that if we cannot present the Christian religion as truly rational and truly moral, true both in the face of scientific discovery and of historical research, we shall lose nine-tenths of the English people from the Christian religion.

It is most important to preserve in every English diocese a centre of sacred learning and sacred eloquence. One of the real difficulties to be faced is that erudition and eloquence are so seldom combined in a single individual. In our view every cathedral chapter should seek to possess two great scholars and two great popular orators, and that these four, in combination, should be supremely responsible for religious education in the diocese.

Modernism for Youth.

Young Modernists will welcome the publication of the first number of *The Way*, a quarterly journal, dealing with Christianity and the modern world.[1] *The Way* is edited by the Rev. K. G. Budd, author of *The Story of Donald Hankey* and *The*

[1] Published by the Modern Churchmen's Union, price 6d. *per* copy or 2/- *per annum* (1937).

Fountains of Faith, a member of the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union. The magazine is intended to serve a double purpose. (1) To provide religious enlightenment and stimulus for young people, and (2) to supply an account of current happenings in Modernist circles such as was provided in the *News Letter* so interestingly edited for many years by the Rev. F. G. Given-Wilson.

The first number of *The Way* is introduced to its readers by the Dean of St. Paul's, who writes :

> '*The Way* will appeal to all those who are not prepared to shut their eyes to the modern situation or to abandon belief because its traditional expressions are questioned and questionable.'

The place of honour is given to an article by the Rev. Canon Anson, Master of the Temple. Its theme is 'Christianity — The World Religion' : the substance of an address delivered in Canterbury Cathedral to the Congress of World Religions. It is an admirable exposition of a Christian faith at once comprehensive, sympathetic, tolerant : but also judiciously discriminating.

A no less valuable article, but of quite another kind, is contributed by the Rev. M. R. McRae Cann, assistant chaplain, Latymer Upper School. It treats in a very practical and hopeful way the problem of the religious education of schoolboys. It deserves serious attention from all those engaged in this difficult task who recognize that the old methods will not do and yet are not able to produce a more satisfactory substitute for them.

Mr. Frank E. Harris, of the Youth Committee of the British Christian Council for International Friendship, Life and Work, deals with the part which Christian youth can play in the evolution of the new world order. This article is somewhat vague, but is optimistic and stresses the importance of the Christian character of the individual as a prime necessity if the world is to be Christianized in the best sense of that term.

The Rev. T. J. Wood provides a thoughtful exposition of Modernism — a much misunderstood term, but one which, as it has come to stay, demands that it should be understood.

If succeeding numbers of *The Way* are equal in quality to the first number, we predict for it a wide circulation.

THE ORIGIN OF THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION AND ITS HISTORY FROM 1898 TO 1923

EDITORIAL PREFATORY NOTE

Having received various requests from our readers to publish in the *Modern Churchman* an account of the origin and history of the Modern Churchmen's Union, we have felt that the demand would best be met by re-publishing a pamphlet entitled *The Modern Movement in the Church of England,* written in 1923 by the late Philip H. Bagenal, O.B.E., and published by the Churchmen's Union. Mr. Bagenal, a barrister holding an important position in the Home Office, was a devoted worker for the Modernist cause, being for some years the Honorary Secretary of the Churchmen's Union. His pamphlet was the expansion of an article contributed by him to the *Hibbert Journal.*

As Mr. Bagenal had free access to all documents relating to the origin and history of the Churchmen's Union, we have no doubt that his account may be relied upon as accurate.

In re-publishing his account we have omitted one undated document dealing with the Union's endeavour to secure Prayer Book Revision which is substantially covered in a subsequent section of the pamphlet. Words enclosed within square brackets have, for purposes of elucidation, been added by the Editor.

THE Churchmen's Union is the modified descendant of the old Broad Church movement with which the names of Frederick Denison Maurice, Charles Kingsley, and Dean Stanley are still so vividly connected. They in their turn had followed the traditions of such men as Whately, Hampden, Thirlwall, Colenso in the earlier part of the Victorian era.

But before the Churchmen's Union came to birth in 1898 there had been in existence for fifty years a private society known as the C.C.C. colloquially, otherwise the Curates' Clerical Club, which still survives. It was a discussion club to which most of the Broad Churchmen in this country at that time belonged, and of which, in its early days, Maurice, Kingsley, and Stanley had been members. It is necessary to sketch in a few words the position of Broad Churchmen at the end of the last century. The

long controversy between science and religion which arose over Darwin's *Origin of Species* was dying down, and was being succeeded by the present controversy between history and the current views of the origins of Christianity. It is remarkable how little attention was at first paid by journalists, and indeed by all outside a small circle, to the rapid development of historic criticism. And yet the cleavage between Christian thinkers occasioned by such scientific discoveries as Darwinism was much less deep and disturbing than that between historical research and criticism, and Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical orthodoxy. The old leaders of thought in the Church had given way during the interval between the sixties and the eighties to other teachers. such as Matthew Arnold, Sir John Seeley, Dr. Hatch, Dr. Sanday, and Dr. Edwin Abbott. The effect of historical criticism was everywhere being felt. It was clear that restatement and reinterpretation of religious belief as against mediaeval tradition was implied in the modern outlook. Who would take up so difficult, nay, dangerous, a task? Men looked round, and wished and wondered. The need was great. Many realized quite clearly the lack of organization. Others saw that opportunities for the exchange of ideas and a nearer fellowship between the clergy and the laity were peremptorily required. Instances of clerical persecution pointed to the necessity of some form of Vigilance Committee to defend clergy attacked for liberal teaching and preaching. In fact, some organization for the spread of views more in consonance with the assured results of critical and historical methods seemed an undeniable call of a new epoch in life and thought. Many suggestions were made to found an organization, but the elder men were generally against it in principle. They said, like Dean Stanley, that Broad Churchmen were not a party, but a school of independent thought within the Church.

Almost to the end of the century men like Llewellyn Davies, Brooke Lambert, and Bradley Alford held that there was no essential unity amongst liberal Churchmen, and that a too pronounced divergence and independence of standpoint would soon split any organization. Moreover, the evils of partisanship were at the time so obvious in the disputes between Protestant and Anglo-Catholic organizations that men with wider views and

sympathies were not willing to be harnessed to any too pronounced definition in spiritual matters. Clearly new men and new measures were required.

A chance circumstance favoured an attempt. This was the sudden appearance in 1898 of a weekly paper called the *Church Gazette*. It was owned and edited by the Rev. W. Routh, a clergyman of the Church of England. It advocated a liberal view of theology, freedom of criticism and research, a comprehensive National Church, and the rights of the laity to a responsible position in that Church.

Life and liberty, in fact. Here, at all events, was a raft to stand upon. The paper immediately opened its columns to the advocates of Broad Church views. A correspondence was set on foot by the Rev. H. C. Rosedale, vicar of St. Peter's, Ladbroke Gardens, advocating a conference of those who held such views. This, after a preliminary meeting in Bradford in Church Congress week, came to pass on 28th July, 1898, in London. The following resolutions were then passed :

> '1. That this meeting desires to express its sense of the necessity of taking steps in order to unite the body of Churchmen who consider that dogma is susceptible of reinterpretation and restatement in accordance with the clearer perception of truth attained by discovery and research.
>
> '2. That in order to prevent the falling away of the thoughtful and educated from the Church, this meeting pledges itself to support an organization which shall unite together all such Churchmen.
>
> '3. That a provisional committee be appointed to meet and consider the best steps to be taken to give effect to the above resolutions.
>
> '4. That the *Church Gazette* be the official organ.'

Unfortunately, the *Church Gazette* only survived a short time. Its courageous and self-sacrificing editor spent a considerable sum of money on the venture, but received insufficient support to enable him to continue it. But it was undoubtedly the mustard-seed of the Churchmen's Union.

No time was lost in putting these resolutions into action. Further meetings of the provisional committee laid the foundations of the Society, and drafted the aims and objects of the Society, which was then named and remains the Churchmen's Union for the Advancement of Liberal Religious Thought. The Society was formally inaugurated on 31st October, 1898, at a

successful meeting at the Church House, Westminster. A year after, on 6th October, 1899 (the eve of the Church Congress), the first annual meeting took place at St. Peter's parish room, Bayswater. It was preceded by a celebration of the Holy Communion. The present Dean of Carlisle, Dr. Rashdall, now the President of the Churchmen's Union, preached the first annual sermon.

The first report of the Union, dated 6th October, 1899, is memorable for its declaration of the aims and objects of the Society, which, with some expansion on the social side, remain to-day. They run as follows:

> '1. To defend and maintain the teaching of the Church of England as the historic Church of the country and as being Apostolic and Reformed.
>
> '2. To uphold the historic comprehensiveness and corporate life of the Church of England and her Christian tolerance in all things non-essential.
>
> '3. To give all the support in their power to those who are honestly and loyally endeavouring to vindicate the truths of Christianity by the light of scholarship and research, while paying due regard to continuity, to work for such changes in the formularies and practices of the Church of England as from time to time are made necessary by the needs and knowledge of the day.
>
> '4. To work for the restoration to the laity of an effective voice in all Church matters.
>
> '5. To encourage friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.'

Thus the little ship was launched on the stormy waters of Church politics, without influence or wealth, with only the expressed goodwill of a few score of friends and supporters. But there was at the head a group of well-equipped scholars earnest and self-sacrificing in the pursuit of liberty of thought and expression, and confident that they were on the right path to secure truth and comprehensiveness in the Church of England. How would they fare?

From the very first the Society had received letters of encouragement from such broad-minded men as Dean Farrer, Dean Bradley, Dean Lefroy, Dean Fremantle, Dr. Welldon, Archdeacons Madden and Waugh, and other names that were well known in Church circles of all parties. But also it had become an object of suspicion, fear, and dislike to both ritualists

and evangelicals. The tactics of a conspiracy of silence were adopted, and when that failed to muzzle the movement there followed misrepresentation and a campaign of unworthy innuendo.

The first years of the century were an uphill struggle to keep the organization afloat. During this period the presidents of the Union were successively the Rev. Professor Henslow; the Rev. Dr. Morrison, now Rector of St. Marylebone's Church; the late Sir C. Thomas Dyke Acland; and then Professor Percy Gardner, well known in the fields of history, archaeology and divinity. For many years the Rev. W. Manning, M.A., rector of Chipping Barnet, was secretary to the Union. Those who know the ups and downs, the spiritual despondency and the material difficulties of pioneers of opinions in England, can understand and admire the patience and persistent courage of the leaders of the movement under such troubles. To all outward appearances, with apparently a small and dispersed following, and certainly a slender exchequer, it seemed a forlorn hope. But behind the little vanguard there were thousands of men and women of education who had long been alienated by the excesses of ecclesiastical extravagance and religious bigotry and ignorance, and who saw in the Churchmen's Union a new star to which they could hitch their wagon and patiently wait for further developments which were shortly to arise.

The need of an organ in the press had always been apparent to the leaders of the Modern movement, but their attempt in that direction had been unfortunate. For a short time the *Church of England Pulpit* served as the organ of the Society, and the leaders met in its offices in Fleet Street. That arrangement did not last long.

In November, 1904, another effort was made by members of the Union, and a quarterly magazine called the *Liberal Churchman* was set on foot and ran until November, 1908, under the able editorship of the Rev. W. D. Morrison, LL.D. Amongst its contributors were Canon Hensley Henson, now Bishop of Durham; Rev. Dr. (now Dean) Rashdall; Rev. W. R. (now Dean) Inge; Professor Percy Gardner; Professor Caldecott; Rev. H. D. A. Major, and others. From the point of view of ability and literary presentation of the new school of theological thought the venture might very well challenge criticism, but a

quarterly magazine did not meet the needs of the times, which demanded greater continuity and more regular emphasis. The returns could not justify the expenditure, and the publication was regretfully discontinued.

Two years afterwards, however, the *Modern Churchman*, 'a magazine to maintain the cause of truth, freedom, and comprehensiveness in the Church of England,' sprang into life. It was founded and is still edited by the Rev. H. D. A. Major, D.D., now Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford, a New Zealander, and a graduate of his native University as well as of Exeter College, Oxford. Since April, 1911, the magazine has increased its circulation and influence year by year until it has reached an audience far beyond the members of the Churchmen's Union, whose official organ it at once became. Its courage and plain speaking united, inspired, and strengthened many who were almost inclined to despair of the National Church. What *Tracts for the Times* were for the High Church party in the Oxford movement, that the *Modern Churchman* has been for most Anglican Liberals and Modernists to-day.

During 1903-4 the Church was much agitated by various doctrinal discussions in the periodicals. Canon Hensley Henson's contribution on 'The Bible of the Future' raised a great hubbub for its plain speaking in favour of modern criticism. Dean Fremantle's utterances on the Virgin Birth at a meeting of the Churchmen's Union also came in for an onslaught. This particular subject produced an interesting episode.

One of the objects of the Society was to do what was possible to defend Church of England clergy and scholars in the right of freedom of thought and expression in religious opinion. In 1903 the case of the Rev. Mr. Beeby, vicar of Yardley Wood, Worcester, became one of public interest. This clergyman had written an article in the *Hibbert Journal* on 'The Doctrinal Significance of the Miraculous Birth.' The Bishop of Worcester (Dr. Gore) took action at once and inhibited the writer. In the *Hibbert Journal* for April, 1904, the Council of the Churchmen's Union published a protest against the Bishop's action and methods.

The question was accordingly raised at the next annual meeting of the Union. An animated discussion took place which is

worth recording. Sir Edward Russell said, in moving the adoption of the Report, that the alternative of the Church lay between freedom of thought under episcopal sanction and encouragement, and the ideals of Lord Halifax and the English Church Union.

Canon Hensley Henson said a religious teacher was beyond all others under an obligation to be absolutely honest in thought and speech. He protested against men who endeavoured to do their duty being paraded as traitors and infidels. It was a very familiar method in the earliest stages of a controversy to create an atmosphere of prejudice and unreasoning opposition. That method, it seemed, was now being pursued in the Church of England by highly-placed individuals, and by the clerical press almost without exception. There was a real danger lest a wave of obscurantism should be worked up which would do infinite harm to religion in England. Every English Churchman who cared for honesty, for liberty of thought, and for the future of Christianity in England should come forward and oppose this danger. The Canon is now a Bishop, and there is no reason to think he has gone back upon his views.

Sir Mountstuart Grant Duff said that a very large proportion of the clergy seemed to be living in a dream. The number of laymen of his generation who sincerely believed in a large proportion of the doctrines they listened to was not very great, and the number was decreasing.

Revision of the Book of Common Prayer has been a subject of controversy for years without very much practical advance. Beautiful the Prayer Book services are, but they present admitted defects which too often exclude a number of religious people from the Church of England and conscientious men from her ministry. It is impossible to preserve uniformity of use, and it is difficult to accommodate the feelings of Anglo-Catholics, Evangelicals, and Modern Churchmen.

* * * *

In the year 1905-6 the famous Letters of Business were issued by Parliament in consequence of the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners on Ecclesiastical Discipline. The Council took immediate action in the matter, and in January,

1907, issued the following petition to the House of Convocation, asking that regard should be had to the following principles :

'I. (1) The essential comprehensiveness of the Church of England, which they desire to maintain to the fullest extent recommended by the Royal Commissioners.

'(2) The consequent need for elasticity in its ordinances, preserving as great latitude of doctrine and practice as is compatible with the character of the Church of England as a reformed church.

'(3) A full and frank recognition of the established results of modern learning in regard to the Books of Holy Scripture, the history of the Church, and the developments of its creeds and formularies.

'(4) The encouragement of liberal thought and free and independent study among the clergy, in accordance with their ordination promise "to be diligent not only in reading the Holy Scriptures, but in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same."

'(5) Full recognition of the rights of the laity to a voice in the Councils of the Church.

'II. They earnestly hope that their Lordships and the members of the Lower House of Convocation will not, by canon or otherwise, approve that part of the Commissioners' recommendations which relates to the procedure in prosecutions for heresy or ritual prosecutions. They regard the present constitution of the Final Court of Appeal in ecclesiastical cases as affording to all parties in the Church of England the best security for liberty of thought and opinion, and view with alarm the power which the recommendations seem to secure to a majority of the Bishops by narrowing the limits of comprehension by deciding questions which the Church of England has deliberately left open, and thus practically adding to the doctrines of the Church.

'III. They further hope that the present opportunity will be taken to remove certain difficulties, some of which now prevent the educated laity from joining without serious mental reservation in the Church Service, while others put a strain on the consciences of the clergy and of candidates for ordination.

'The difficulties to which they refer, and certain other defects in the liturgy, would be removed by alterations which should include—

(1) The cessation of the compulsory use of the Athanasian Creed.

(2) A revision of the Old Testament lessons for Sunday.

(3) Some liberty in the use of the Psalter.

(4) An alteration in the form and manner of making of Deacons from "*Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?*" to "*Do you believe that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation?*" as in the form of Ordering of Priests.

(5) The optional substitution of the two commandments of the Gospel for the Decalogue in the Service of the Holy Communion.

(6) The disuse of the first part of the Commination Service.

(7) The abbreviation of the preface to the Marriage Service.

(8) The optional use of the long exhortation in the Communion Office.

(9) The shortening of the Baptismal Office and the substitution of the terms of the Apostles' Creed as used at Morning and Evening Prayer for the terms now used in that Office.

(10) The avoidance of certain repetitions and archaic expressions in the Services.'

The petition was presented to Convocation by the Bishop of Winchester and Canon (now Bishop) Hensley Henson.

Such were the principles and opinions put forward some sixteen years ago when the Letters of Business were first opened.

At various times during the past twenty years efforts have been made by the opponents of freedom of criticism to muzzle the scholars and students of the day, in spite of Dr. Gore's old championship in 1884 and 1904. In a sermon delivered before the University of Oxford and published, Dr. Gore said :

'It is impossible in any way to withdraw the historical basis of Christianity from the freest and frankest criticism. If there exist persons who say, "Let the Old Testament be frankly criticised, for it is not so important, but not the New Testament, for it is vital," the claim must be repudiated utterly. In proportion to the important issues which hang upon the New Testament records must be the frankness of the criticism to which they are submitted.'

But the extremists of the E.C.U. made great efforts to stem the rising flood of modern criticism. Several memorials carefully planned to damage the position of the Churchmen's Union were presented to Convocation, and much pressure was brought to inflict a severe blow on the new school of thought, and to restrict that freedom which English Churchmen still enjoy in doctrinal and ecclesiastical questions.

In reply, the Union drew up a petition to Convocation, which was presented by Dr. Burge, then Bishop of Southwark, now Bishop of Oxford, and supported by the Bishops of Lincoln and Hereford.

It ran as follows :

'Whereas matters of grave import have lately been brought before your Reverend House concerning the intellectual freedom of the Clergy and the relation of Episcopal to non-Episcopal Churches :

'We, the Council of the Churchmen's Union, desire respectfully to lay before your Lordships' House the urgent considerations following :

I. The Church of England has at all periods since the Reformation included both those who do not and those who do accept the

doctrine of the "Apostolical succession" and the necessity of Episcopacy as a matter of *jus divinum*. We earnestly trust that your Lordships will do nothing to curtail the liberty in this respect which the formularies of our Church allow, and which its Clergy and Laity have hitherto in practice enjoyed.

II. We trust that nothing will be done to make it more difficult for individual Bishops, other Clergy, and Laymen, to act as their own conscience and judgment direct in the matter of co-operation and religious fellowship with the members of non-Episcopal Churches.

III. We regard it as a matter of grave importance that the clergy should be encouraged to study and discuss reverently and freely the critical and historical problems which are forced upon the modern student of the Old and New Testaments, to publish the result of their studies, and to face the task of interpreting and restating the traditional doctrines of Christianity in such ways as may be demanded by newly discovered truth.

IV. While asserting without reserve our belief in the Incarnation and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, we submit that a wide liberty of belief should be allowed with regard to the mode and attendant circumstances of both.

V. We believe that real study, thought, and discussion will be discouraged if clergymen, who, in matters not affecting the essential truth of Christianity, arrive at conclusions which are opposed to traditional or momentarily dominant opinions, are to be removed from their offices or denounced as dishonest for retaining them. We venture to recall to your Lordships the dictum of Archbishop [Frederick] Temple, "*If the conclusions are prescribed, the study is precluded.*"

V. We dutifully and respectfully pray your Lordships to remember how often in the past, when the Episcopate or the Convocations have attempted to pronounce authoritatively upon scientific, critical, or historical questions, they have committed themselves to positions which are now by practically universal consent admitted to be untenable.'

The Modern movement in religious thought in the present century may be said to have finally found itself in two events — the foundation of the *Modern Churchman*, and the establishment of the Conferences which became known to the public.

Conferences were commenced in 1914, and have continued ever since. The first was organized in the spring before the war broke out, and held at Ripon on 3rd to 7th July. Unlike the Church Congress, they were continued throughout the war. The idea underlying the Conference was to initiate meetings among Churchmen of different degrees of knowledge and experience, yet all of whom felt the pressure of modern knowledge and ways of thinking, and desired to see them employed in the service of

the Christian religion. What a wide horizon of inquiry was opened is best appreciated by giving the subjects of the Conferences which have been held since 1914.

At Ripon, 1914, the subject was 'Christ, the Creed, the Church.' At Rugby, 1915, 'Religious Teaching,' 'Kikuyu Problems,' 'Urgent Church Reforms,' 'Training of the Clergy.' At Oxford, 1916, 'Church Ethics.' At Cambridge, 1917, 'The Church: its Origin, Functions, Authority, Sacraments, Freedom, and Psychology.' At Cambridge, 1918, 'The Psychology of Religious Experience.' At Kensington, 1919, 'The Ideals of Modern Churchmen,' 'Present-day Problems.' At Oxford, 1920, 'Modern Knowledge and Traditional Christianity.' At Cambridge, 1921, 'Christ and the Creeds.' At Oxford, 1922, 'Christianity as the World Religion.' At Cambridge, 1923, 'Christ and Human Society.'

The Conference of 1921 brought the Churchmen's Union into new prominence, and won for it a large measure of public support. The object of the nineteen papers which were read by well-known scholars was to formulate in modern language an answer to the age-long question, What think ye of Christ? Though the papers were admittedly careful and reverent, misleading newspaper reports, with startling head-lines, provoked a storm of criticism in both press and pulpit. The outburst of panic ceased when the papers were published in the *Modern Churchman* for October: but the religious papers of all kinds carried on an animated discussion throughout the autumn and winter. One result was notable. Mr. Major, in replying to a letter of Canon Peter Green in the columns of the *Church Times*, used a phrase which gave Mr. C. E. Douglas, a curate in the Canterbury province, an excuse for bringing a charge of heresy against him. In a 'delation for heresy' addressed to the Bishop of Oxford, Mr. Douglas affirmed that Mr. Major 'openly taught a doctrine concerning the Resurrection which is contrary to the Christian religion as set forth in the ancient creeds and book of Common Prayer, and in Holy Scripture.' The Bishop of Oxford took the constitutional course of submitting the charge to four Professors of Divinity in the University of Oxford — Professors Headlam, Lock, Watson, and Turner — asking them to report whether there was a *prima facie* case for holding a formal en-

quiry. Professor Turner excused himself on the ground that he did not think it fitting that a layman should advise upon proceedings against a clergyman. The other three Professors, having considered the charge and Mr. Major's reply both separately and in consultation, reported that in their opinion there was no sufficient ground for proceeding to a formal trial. In January, 1922, the Bishop of Oxford published his decision in accordance with the verdict of the three Professors. [Mr. Douglas then appealed to the Primate, who dismissed the appeal.]

But this was a side issue, only accidentally connected with the Conference. The real question was raised in February, 1922, when certain members of the English Church Union presented to the Convocations of Canterbury and York a 'petition and gravamen' directed against the volume containing the official report of the Conference. They asked the Bishops 'to declare that such opinions are contrary to the teaching of the Bible and the Church.'

The Gravamen runs as follows :

> 'Inasmuch as certain erroneous interpretations concerning the Godhead of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and His Holy Incarnation, and concerning the doctrine of the Holy Blessed and Glorious Trinity . . . have been advanced by certain clergymen of the Church of England in a Conference held at Girton . . .
>
> 'This House humbly desires his Grace the President and their Lordships of the Upper House to declare that such opinions are contrary to the teaching of the Bible and the Church.'

The discussion being deferred till the May session of Convocation the Council of the Churchmen's Union were able at that session to present a counter-petition to the Bishops of both provinces, signed not only by representative members of the Union but also by a number of distinguished theologians who were not connected with it.

The result of the proceedings in both Convocations was a disappointment to the traditionalists. After full consideration and prolonged debate the Bishops of both provinces passed resolutions, substantially to the same effect, which contained no charge of heresy against any of the writers. The pronouncements of both Convocations, indeed, may well be considered a victory for Modern Churchmen, as being essentially formulae of

comprehension. They are such as can be assented to by any of the readers and speakers at the Cambridge Conference.

The Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation unanimously adopted the following report:

> 'This House recognizes the gain which arises from inquiry, at once fearless and reverent, into the meaning and expression of the faith, and welcomes every aid which the thoughtful student finds in the results of sound historical and literary criticism, and of modern scientific investigation of the problems of human psychology; and it deprecates the mere blunt denunciation of contributions made by earnest men in their endeavour to bring new light to bear upon these difficult and anxious problems. At the same time it sees a grave and obvious danger in the publication of debatable suggestions as if they were ascertained truths, and emphasizes the need of caution in the whole matter, especially on the part of responsible teachers in the Church.'

It should be added that no one could more heartily approve the last paragraph of this report than the Modernists themselves. The 'publication of debatable suggestions as if they were ascertained truths' is one of the greatest foes with which they have to contend. If sometimes they are led away to follow a bad example, it is much to be regretted.

The Upper House of the Convocation of York passed a resolution still more favourable to the Liberal claims.

Recently the Council of the Union has set up a Publications Committee to publish both volumes and pamphlets representing the Broad Church view. Mr. John Murray has published for the Committee six volumes by prominent members of the Union; of the pamphlets the present is the third to appear.

Such is a brief account of the rise and the activities of the Churchmen's Union, and of the controversies in which it has been involved. But it would be a great mistake to suppose that it is primarily a militant or controversial body. In all such societies there are a few members who love a fight. And when members of the society are attacked, they are obliged to defend themselves. But the Union exists not for controversial purposes, but to set forth the great truths of Christianity in a manner suited to the new intellectual and moral environment, and to continue the work of a school which has always existed in the English Church, and to which many of its most illustrious teachers have belonged.

SACRAMENTS: NATURAL AND UNNATURAL

By the Rev. H. G. Hutchison, B.D.

THE Church of England is in danger of going on the rocks. That is because of the fog. The fog is being generated with increasing density by those who teach an erroneous sacramental doctrine.

With a little exaggeration, pardonable in an opening paragraph, this is my serious opinion. Let me explain.

There is a laudable inclination among men to save trouble. All laws, conventions, rules, customs and traditions are (among other things) trouble-savers. They do away with the necessity to think: to go back to first principles every time. We have our situation on the one hand, and our collection of labels on the other. All we then have to do is to apply the right label. Was it murder or was it manslaughter? We need only apply the rules. Was it burglary or only housebreaking? We have only to determine the exact time at which the offence was committed, and then we can deal with it according to law. Thus we only need to look at the *two ends* of the reasoning process which finds that housebreaking is a punishable offence, though not so severely punishable as burglary: we can *forget the middle part* of the train of reasoning.

Now this is all very well if you are careful. Indeed it is absolutely necessary. Life would be intolerable if we had to argue each case from first principles. But how easy it is to make a mistake, and after leaving out the middle part of a chain of reasoning, to come to a wrong conclusion! Much superstition and magic is the result of such mistakes.

Take an example. A certain herb (when chopped up and taken in water, let us say) cures the stomach ache. 'Very well,' says your peasant, 'if this herb cures the stomach ache I shall wear it round my neck on a string, and then I shall always be free from the pain.' He has forgotten the middle part of the connection: the *way* the herb works, and in doing so has turned

from genuine medical practice to mere superstition. The herb becomes an amulet.

This process of *leaving out the reason* and substituting a purely arbitrary connection affected life from top to bottom in the ancient days, and modern science began only when all these arbitrary, traditional, unreasoned connections were swept aside: when men turned to discover *real* connections by observation and experiment. Right up the scale of mediaeval life, from the basest superstition to the exalted sphere of philosophy, the same process of *forgetting the reason* can be traced. The Church naturally frowned upon such crude practices as that of putting consecrated hosts into beehives to increase the supply of honey, yet at higher levels the same process was at work. The philosopher's stone, if it could only be found, would, for no comprehensible reason, turn base metal into gold. Perhaps the same process was involved even in the idea of the divine right of kings, according to which a king has authority for no comprehensible reason, but simply because he *is* a king. This saves a great deal of trouble. It is much more expedient to know exactly who is the lawful king and to back him up with a permanent inalienable right than to fathom what a king really is for: why he has authority, and whether this particular man is functionally a king or not.

The principle that the unworthiness of the minister does not affect the validity of the sacrament is a convenience of exactly the same kind. It is a great trouble-saver and a short cut to security, but there is no *reason* why it should be true. It can neither be proved nor disproved. It is arbitrarily asserted for the sake of convenience.

Let me put the matter in a nutshell. 'Do this and that will happen.' 'If this is so-and-so it will do that.' Such assertions as these may be either (*a*) statements which can be demonstrated or proved to be true experimentally, or (*b*) groundless statements based upon convenience, ignorance or superstition. In (*a*) there is a natural connection between the terms; in (*b*) there is an arbitrary connection.

Now turn to the Christian sacraments. There are two ways of interpreting them. The two terms of the sacrament (the outward and visible sign and the inward and spiritual grace) can be

thought of as linked by (*a*) a natural connection, or (*b*) an arbitrary connection. Let us take the natural connection first.

(*a*) It is quite comprehensible and natural that Jesus should come in spirit to His friends when they take together the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper in remembrance of Him. Holy Communion, seen in this simple way, has a wide and deep appeal which everyone can appreciate. It is intensely human in the very best sense: with the humanity of Jesus. Or again, the washing of Baptism, with admission to membership of the Church, is *plainly and naturally* the beginning of a new life in grace. Everyone can understand its meaning.

(*b*) But some people are not satisfied with this simple doctrine. While nominally accepting the plain meaning of sacraments, they see in them another element of far greater importance, quite overshadowing the natural meaning. They hold that by an arbitrary decree God has arranged to provide a unique thing, the 'sacramental presence' of Jesus Christ in bread and wine, always, upon the performance of a prescribed rite: or to produce a fundamental change (which is admitted to have no observable effect) in the soul of a person, always, upon the correct performance of the prescribed rite of Baptism.

In (*a*) the connection between the two terms of the sacrament is plain and natural. In (*b*) it is arbitrary, or as many would prefer to say, 'supernatural.' Which of these sacramental doctrines is nearer the truth? First, I think, we may clear the ground by omitting the term 'supernatural.' It is a question-begging term, since to call a connection 'supernatural' is to imply at the outset that it is higher and better than a natural connection. It will be safer, then, to use the word 'mysterious' instead of 'supernatural.'

Now it is customary in explaining the sacraments to assert that they are in line with God's method as seen throughout Creation: that nature is sacramental through and through. Very well then, which of the two kinds of sacrament (*a* or *b*) is found in nature? Speech and gesture are called sacraments of thought. But the connection between the thought and the spoken word, though we do not fully understand it, is natural, not arbitrary. It has a mechanism of brain, nervous system and muscle without which it can never work. An arbitrary sacrament has no

mechanism: it works by the simple decree of God. Then take human conception and birth, which, at first sight, are even more like a 'mysterious' sacrament. Mysterious it is indeed that a microscopic speck of matter can convey a complex hereditary character! But even here there is a mechanism, marvellous as it is. Already scientists can tell us much about the chromosomes which are part of that mechanism. Heredity is no arbitrary connection. Though wonderful beyond our present understanding, it is plainly natural.

If, then, nature is a sacrament, it is a natural sacrament. All its connections are natural, not arbitrary. They work through delicate mechanisms of heat and moisture; of sap, leaf, muscle and nerve cell, and not through the performance of a rite or the pronouncing of a formula. Everything in nature *has* its mechanism, though it may be *more* than mechanism. You cannot get the door to turn on its hinges by crying 'Open Sesame' unless you fit up some electrically operated mechanism, controlled by a microphone! In fact arbitrary connections do not exist. The very idea of them has at last been swept away from the respectable side of life. They linger, of course, in superstition. If you wear a charm, you will, quite arbitrarily, have good luck. But in no respectable department of life are such things tolerated — *except in religion.*

Yet it is easy to see *why* religion sometimes retains 'mysterious' sacramentalism. For one thing, it has been rightly felt that religion is *essentially* mysterious: that a religion devoid of mystery is no religion at all. Though entirely true, this does not justify arbitrary, 'mysterious' sacramentalism. Surely there is enough of genuine mystery in God and man, life and death, good and evil, without adding artificial and unnecessary 'mysteries.' Again, 'mysterious' sacramentalism has had great practical advantages. It, too, is a trouble-saver. It makes for certainty and a feeling of security. You know exactly where you are with such a doctrine. Being hard and fast it is easy to teach and easy to learn (for those who are not scientifically-minded). Again, the process of 'forgetting the reason,' together with the other tendencies which make for formalism, are always at work in religion. In lowly religions they produce mere superstitions: in more moral religions they produce queer ceremonial tabus: and in spiritual religions like Mithraism or Christianity they have

produced mystery sacraments. The sacraments of Mithraism: ceremonial washing, tasting honey, drinking wine or water, eating little cakes marked with a cross, the bath of bull's blood (which gave new life for twenty years or in some cases for ever): all these, in spite of superficial similarities, now appear to be neither causes nor effects of the Christian sacraments. But this only shows how readily the mystery sacrament could grow up in the magic soil of the first three Christian centuries.

For anyone who has taken the trouble to trace the part played by magic in the ancient world, it would indeed seem a miracle if Christianity had remained untouched by it. Historians are not interested in magic. They have looked upon it as an element in ancient civilization, which, having no future, was not worth discussing. Consequently hardly anyone, not even the classical scholar, seems to recognize the ubiquity of magic in the early Christian world. But to those who have happened to make a special study of magic it is as clear as daylight that magic was part of the atmosphere which men breathed in the ancient world. There was a magic of ordinary domestic life, of birth, love, marriage and death; of medicine, law, agriculture and religion; magic had its place in prose literature from Plato down to the banalities of the Egyptian magical papyri; in verse from Homer down to the latest Greek comedy. Ordinary men and women of the ancient world could no more get away from magic than we can get away from the air we breathe. Christians could no more think of denying the efficacy of pagan magic and pagan miracles than we could think of denying the existence of a political party to which we are opposed. They did not deny its efficacy: they opposed it with a more potent force, the power of Christ. I am convinced that only exceptionally enlightened men could see a greater difference between pagan magic and Christian miracle than that the first was done by evil power and the last by good power. No wonder, then, that Jesus, like the prophets before Him, found it hard to get even His most intimate disciples to understand His purely spiritual and moral teaching.

Very early the magical atmosphere of the outside world found its way into the Church. Chrysostom was perhaps the last to fight for the ideal of no magic at all — not even Christian magic. But at last, while the Church energetically attacked 'black,' or pagan, magic, it allowed, and sometimes encouraged

a Christian magic whose methods were very similar though its materials were different. Cross, host, saintly relic and sacred name; fire, water and circumambulation (clockwise or counter-clockwise according to circumstances) were turned against the powers of evil.

Who can doubt, then, that what appears to have happened did happen? That the simple sacraments of Jesus; spiritual, moral and natural; were twisted a little, until they gained that arbitrary, 'mysterious' significance which appealed to the people of the time. The 'mysterious' interpretation of sacraments quite overwhelmed their natural interpretation. Men could not accept the naturalness of Jesus. They twisted Christianity until it came into line with their science, law, literature, medicine, agriculture: until it was just as much tainted with magic, occult influences, arbitrary and mysterious connections as these.

But to-day, in every respectable walk of life, magic has been swept aside. Astrology has given place to astronomy, alchemy to chemistry, geomancy to geology. Yet in the Church of England (not to mention some other Churches) 'mysterious' sacramentalism not only remains alive; it is rapidly growing!

All over the country, clergymen (many of whom would not wish to be called Anglo-Catholics) are dinning into the ears of their congregations, and impressing upon the plastic minds of their Sunday School children and confirmation candidates this false kind of sacramental teaching. They labour at it heroically. They wait patiently, for years, to overcome the resistance to it. They regard it as the most important of Christian truths. And their congregations, for the most part, sit with dumb uncomprehending apathy. The clergy and a small circle of 'instructed' (*i.e.* clericalized) laity seem to be the only persons to whom this doctrine appeals. The rest of the people are, according to their tradition and temperament, acquiescent, or puzzled, or disappointed, or outraged. It is surprising how 'high' (in churchmanship) you have to go among the laity before you find 'mysterious' sacramentalism understood and accepted, and how 'low' you have to go among the clergy before you find it rejected. The clergy are in this respect miles 'above' their laity!

As to the laity, this doctrine would be quite acceptable to the thousands who do not trouble to think for themselves—but for two facts. First, they scent 'popery,' and that they cannot abide.

Secondly, the modern world has made such a clean sweep of 'mysterious connections' that they simply *cannot comprehend* the sacramental teaching which is meted out to them. There is nothing like it in all their world. It seems patently impossible that when the vicar says the prayer of consecration bread and wine should turn into the Divinity. Trying to teach them *that* is like trying to teach algebra to an elephant.

I have put this strongly because I feel it strongly. It is a tragedy. At a time when the public understand the ethical and social importance of religion as never before : when master minds explain these things to them, in their own homes, on the wireless : when nearly everyone realizes that materialism will not do, and that spiritual things (in the widest sense) are important : at this time the Church of England, because of the incomprehensible and false sacramental teaching which is so prominent in it, seems queer, antiquated, out of touch with realities. Hence thousands who still attend their parish churches grow apathetic and disappointed. The Church does not seem to be able to meet their needs. Instead, the clergy harp continually on something which appears to have no connection with real life. The faithful few, good people, stay on grimly, loth to give up even when services grow more and more irrelevant. As to the effect upon those who have already given up their church, who can calculate it? At least it is no wonder that the Church of England gains so little new ground in the home country!

A bishop, while telling me of his sympathy with Liberal Churchmanship, said he thought its value was mostly negative. But here, surely, is a positive task of the greatest importance for Liberal Churchmen. We must not be content to refute false doctrine. We must vigorously teach the true, plain and natural sacramentalism of Jesus Christ. We must help the people to know *why* baptism is the beginning of a new life, and *how natural* it is that the Lord Jesus should be spiritually present with us in the sacrament of His supper. In doing so we shall help them to see that the sacraments of Jesus are not queer, arbitrary, incredible; but as straight and true as God's work everywhere. For liberal-minded clergy the need is to be strong, and to make no compromise. We must reject the false, arbitrary sacramentalism entirely and absolutely if we are to dispel the fog of irrelevance which hangs about the Church of England.

THE 'INDEX OF FORBIDDEN BOOKS'

ONE of the first works to be issued from the Vatican Press after the conclusion in 1929 of the Lateran Treaty between the Pope and Mussolini was a new edition of the Index of Prohibited Books. As was reported in the London *Catholic Herald*, November 16, 1929:

> 'From Our Own Correspondent; Vatican City.—Cardinal Merry del Val has presented to the Pope the first copy of a new edition of the *Index*, just published by the Vatican. The new edition, which runs to 560 pages, contains various departures from former editions. One of these changes is that certain prohibited books are marked with a cross, and others with an asterisk, in order to make a distinction between those books which are prohibited in the most solemn forms (*Index Expurgatorius*) and those which are merely prohibited until the offending passages have been removed or altered (*Index Prohibitorius*). The total number of books prohibited is about fifteen thousand.'

History and Rules.

As the subject of this Roman *Index* is very commonly misunderstood (and by Roman Catholics as well as by others), some elucidation of it may be useful. When I myself was a Roman Catholic, I asked sometimes in confession what were my obligations under the *Index*. The reply always was, 'Use your own judgment'; 'Follow your own conscience.' Now, I do not suggest that the good priests who told me that were shirking their duty. Perhaps they thought I was able to judge soundly; or perhaps they themselves were hazy on the matter. That the latter explanation may be the right one may be shown by an illustration. Some years ago, when Dr. R. Downey (now Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool, but at that time one of the editors of the English *Catholic Gazette* was absent in America, his co-editor (Dr. H. Vaughan) permitted a correspondence to take place about the *Index* in the columns of the magazine. The correspondence led to hopeless confusion. There can be no doubt of the existence of much ignorance on the subject amongst Roman Catholics. To quote the London *Catholic Times* (August 10, 1928):

> 'One hears it not infrequently said — indeed, it is . . . a commonplace contention . . .—"Of course, everyone knows that the *Index* has

no force in this country." . . . It is all rather puzzling . . . "Pure ignorance," as Dr. Johnson once said.'

The truth is that the rules of the *Index* are so opposed to intellectual fair play and progress that it is impossible to enforce them even on Roman Catholics except in countries where clerical rule is very powerful. It nevertheless remains a fact that the rules exist, are enforced wherever and to whatsoever degree possible, and therefore ought to be understood. According to Addis and Arnold's Catholic Dictionary (London, 1917, p. 450):

'In the movement of what is called the Reformation, a deluge of books containing doctrine more or less erroneous was poured over Europe. . . . The matter was taken up by the Council of Trent (session 18), which appointed a commission of some of its members to consider and report on the steps which it was advisable to take about books generally. This commission compiled an "Index of Prohibited Books" accordingly, but the Council in its last session (1563) remitted the whole matter to the Pope. In conformity with this reference, Pope Pius V a few years later erected the Sacred Congregations of the Index. Sixtus V confirmed and enlarged their powers.'

Pope Benedict XIV (1740—1758) elaborated the Congregation's rules. In the nineteenth century Pope Leo XIII paid special attention to the subject, and on January 25, 1891, in a document beginning with the words *Officiorum et Munerum*, he set out a new collection of regulations: those still in force.

What Books are Condemned.

According to a very useful treatise (*A Commentary on the Present Index Legislation*, by Rev. T. Hurley; Dublin, 1911):

'The rules of the *Index*, and the Index of Prohibited Books itself, are intended for the same end and purpose — to make known what would be dangerous reading: but they effect that end in two different ways. The "Rules" state the "classes or kinds" of dangerous literature, whereas the *Index* expressly mentions [by their names] the dangerous works and their authors. . . . Hence it would be a great mistake to suppose that only those works are forbidden which have been expressly condemned and have been inscribed in the *Index*.'

As has been seen, the new edition of the *Index* prohibits (wholly or conditionally) about 15,000 works. It must not be supposed, however, that Roman Catholics are free to read all books except these 15,000 named malefactors. There still remain the 'general rules' by which Roman Catholics are also expected to guide their reading.

By Rule 2 of the *Index* Legislation,

'books of apostates, of heretics, of schismatics, and any writings defending heresy or schism, or undermining the foundations of religion itself, are everywhere prohibited.'

By Rule 3,

'books of non-Catholics, treating professedly of religion, are forbidden unless there is nothing in them against the Catholic faith.'

What of the Bible? To quote Dr. Hurley (p. 75):

'What editions, then, in the vernacular are allowed? Only those that have been duly approved. By whom are they to be approved? By the Holy See and by bishops.'

By Rule 11 of the *Index*

'books are condemned that detract God, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Saints, the Church, the Sacraments, or the Apostolic See; books that give erroneous ideas of the nature or extent of the divine inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures; books that assail the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the clerical or the religious states' (that is, the conventual orders).

Rule 12: 'Books on sorcery, magic, divination, the evocation of spirits, or any superstition,' are forbidden. Rule 13: 'Writings narrating new apparitions, visions, prophecies, or miracles; or that would introduce new devotions,' are proscribed. Rule 14 forbids 'books defending duelling, suicide, or divorce; or defending Freemasonry or kindred societies; or defending any propositions condemned by the Holy See.' Roman Catholics, in short, are restricted, in their religious reading, to the narrow limits of Papal orthodoxy. The most timid Modernism is as much forbidden as the rankest immorality. Moreover, by Rule 45, 'books condemned by the Apostolic See are prohibited everywhere, and translations of them also are forbidden.'

We may now note a few of the books which are condemned by name:

Hallam's *Constitutional History* and *Middle Ages;* Erasmus Darwin's *Zoonomia*; Sterne's *Sentimental Journey*; Hugo's *Les Misérables*; the romances of the two Dumas; all the works of David Hume and Thomas Hobbes; Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*; Ranke's *History of the Popes*; Descartes' philosophical works ('unless corrected': except the *Meditations*, which is entirely forbidden); all the romances of

d'Annunzio; Paul Sabatier's *Francis Assisi*; Pascal's *Pensées* and *Les Provinciales*; J. S. Mill's *Political Economy*; all the theological works of Renan, Grotius, Fogazzaro, Lord Acton, 'Janus,' Malebranche, Voltaire, and 'Febronius'; Gregorovius's *Papal History*; Comte's *Positivist Philosophy*; Cudworth's *Intellectual System*; Draper's *Religion and Science*; Andrew Lang's *Myth, Ritual and Religion*; and—*The Book of Common Prayer*.

The above is a merely casual selection from a long catalogue.

In the working of the *Index* system delation in the form of secret denunciation is encouraged.

> 'All Catholics, and especially those that excel in learning, are expected to denounce bad and dangerous books to their bishops, or to the Apostolic See. . . . Finally, the denouncers are not to be afraid that their names will be divulged; for the members of the Congregation are strictly bound to keep them a dead secret' (Hurley, pp. 176 and 178).

The *Catholic Herald*, November 30, 1929, defending the *Index*, said that by it 'liberty is not shackled; only safeguarded.' The foregoing account of the *Index* suffices to show how rigid are the safeguards! The theory behind the *Index* is the old fallacy that because some people may go wrong, therefore everyone must be 'molly-coddled.'

It is true that the clergy are given power to dispense individuals from some or any of the *Index* prohibitions: but, even so, the rules are there, and they form a clerical censorship on learning.

One of the books prohibited by name is *Steps towards Reunion*, by Rev. J. Duggan (Kegan Paul, London, 1897): an English Roman Catholic priest who advocated that the Roman Church might 'reconsider its position in relation to heretical and schismatical churches,' by removing many needless burdens imposed by authority. The *Index* may fairly be reckoned amongst those burdens; but unfortunately Father Duggan's plea was not heeded, and his book is amongst the forbidden.

J. W. Poynter.

THE GREATEST OF THE ANTI-POPES

ANTI-POPES, like traitors, were in general an unfortunate class of people. In the Dark Ages, when disputed elections to the Papacy were frequent, an anti-Pope was usually the one who succumbed in the struggle for existence. Later on he was an ecclesiastic set up by an Emperor who had quarrelled with the reigning Pope; he commonly ended by being disavowed by his patron, paraded through Rome on an ass, and, if he was lucky, immured in a monastery. The subject of Dr. Mackinnon's volume,[1] however, is not one of these transient and embarrassed phantoms but the man who made the little town by the Leman Lake for a while the rival of the City of the Seven Hills. In the great upheaval against the mediaeval system two mighty personalities were thrown up, Luther and Calvin, sharply contrasted with one another, like Danton and Robespierre in the French Revolution or Trotsky and Lenin in Russia the other day, the one burly, overbearing, titanic, the other precise, dogmatic, but with iron will and determination. If Luther supplied the popular dynamic for the Reformation, Calvin gave it order, discipline, a body of doctrine.

Gibbon says of Eutyches, the true founder of Monophysitism, that he is an unfortunate parent, disowned by most of his spiritual children. Something the same may be said of Calvin. Till the rise of Karl Barth with his neo-Calvinism, the name of Calvin was unpopular even in Scotland. His voluminous works slumbered on the shelf. When the present writer was a boy, his father acquired the complete works of Calvin, seven folio volumes printed at Amsterdam in the early seventeenth century, for the modest sum of eighteenpence; it cost more to bring them home on a hand-cart. Nor has Calvin been particularly fortunate in his biographers. The expansive, richly human character of Luther has attracted men who had little sympathy with his doctrine, like the Frenchman Michelet, and he still holds a warm

[1] *Calvin and the Reformation.* By James Mackinnon, Ph.D., D.D., D.Th., LL.D. (Longmans, Green and Co., 1936. 16/-.)

place in the feelings of most Germans; but Calvin the Schoolman has been neglected.

It would be too much to expect that Dr. Mackinnon should replace the fallen idol on its pedestal; the Regius Professor Emeritus of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Edinburgh lacks one qualification for a successful biographer, perfect sympathy with the subject of the biography. Yet if anyone desires to know all that an ordinary reader wishes to know about the public life and writings of Calvin, he cannot do better than buy or borrow this book. It is written with a thorough knowledge of the subject and with a candour which is quite disarming. What sort of a figure is it that emerges from this close study?

A strangely enigmatical one, it must be confessed, and full of contradictions which it is difficult to harmonize. On the one hand we have the man who had mastered all the learning available at his time.

> 'His erudition is remarkable. He knows some of the Schoolmen and many of the Fathers, and is steeped in the literature of classical antiquity — its philosophy as well as its more purely literary products. The numerous citations from the ancient writers — Christian and non-Christian — are not merely ornamental or far-fetched, but evidently come voluntarily from the store of a richly filled and highly cultured mind . . . He knows the Bible in the original languages by heart.'

Nor is this learning mere dead lumber; he knows how to organize his knowledge and to build out of it a great theological system. His command of Latin and French is equally complete; his French translation of the *Institutes* places him in the ranks of the greatest French writers. His style, according to a French literary critic quoted by our author, is one of the grandest styles of the sixteenth century, simple, concise, elegant, lucid, ingenious, animated, varied in both form and tone. A statesman no less than a writer, the Protestant Hildebrand watched over the interests of Protestantism from Poland to Scotland.

That is one side of Calvin, Calvin the scholar, thinker, and humanist. There is another Calvin, the grim Dictator of the tiny republic of thirteen thousand souls, at whose instigation a free-thinker and minor poet who is suspected of having written a poster denouncing Calvin is racked with excruciating torments to make him disclose the names of imaginary accomplices, till he urges his tormentors to end his sufferings by inflicting the

death penalty forthwith, a favour which is ultimately granted him. The Consistory, or Council of ministers and lay elders, has its spies who denounce for punishment those guilty not only of immorality but of such varied offences as playing at cards, Papistical opinions, using charms for healing purposes, criticizing the ministers. Under the reign of the saints women accused of conspiring to spread the pestilence and devoting themselves to the Devil have their hands cut off and are burnt at the stake. It does not appear that Calvin and his fellow-ministers were responsible for this atrocity common enough, no doubt, during the Middle Ages, but Calvin the same year demands a legal inquisition against sorcerers in order to extirpate the race.

There is no doubt, at any rate, that Calvin must be held accountable for the death of Servetus, of whose judicial murder Dr. Mackinnon gives a heartbreaking account. Servetus was a Spaniard, a stranger to Geneva, and one over whom the Council and Consistory had no natural authority. A physician who combined scientific tastes with deep religious feeling and a real devotion to our Lord, he had been led in his theological speculations to a kind of Sabellianism. We will quote a few sentences from the account of his death.

> 'He begged for a milder form of death than burning lest his sufferings should drive him to belie his convictions. After prostrating himself in prayer he was bound to the stake, a chaplet of twigs covered with sulphur placed on his head, and the fire lighted. A piercing cry of anguish as the fire shot up into his face sent a thrill of horror through the crowd. Perhaps, as Doumergue argues, the sulphur fumes speedily suffocated the martyr. According to Bolsec and Castellion [contemporaries] the wood was wet and he suffered terrible torture from the slow-burning faggots before he expired. His last words were, "Jesus, Son of the eternal God, have mercy upon me." His fidelity to his convictions is seen in the fact that, in invoking Jesus, he refrained from the orthodox formula, "eternal Son of God."'

During the nineteenth century the Swiss Church has erected at Geneva an expiatory monument to Servetus.

To avoid a violent and perhaps unjust revulsion of feeling against Calvin it is necessary to remind ourselves that similar scenes were enacted all over Europe in Papal and Protestant countries during the sixteenth century. Perhaps we sentimental humanitarians, the survivors of the nineteenth century, are too

tender-hearted in these matters, and when the fast-rising tide of fanaticism which seems likely to overwhelm us has reached its full height, we shall see a return to the virile barbarity of the Middle Ages. Things do seem to be progressing, or reacting, in that direction in Spain and elsewhere.

Of the domestic life of Calvin we are far from possessing the almost embarrassing abundance of detail which we possess of that of Luther. Luther's love of music, his warm family attachments, have endeared him to his fellow-countrymen, and if the relics of the saint as exhibited in his house at Wittenberg consist largely of drinking vessels of Gargantuan proportions, those who are not ascetics will like him none the worse for that. A French admirer of Calvin, M. Doumergue, has written (so Professor Mackinnon tells us) an illuminating if enthusiastic chapter on the inside life of Calvin, or 'Calvin at Home,' as he calls it ('Calvin chez lui'). The reformer found a helpmate and a happy marriage in Idelette de Bure, whom he calls the best companion of his life and the faithful helper of his ministry. She died after nine years. Unfortunately, Dr. Mackinnon does not enlighten us further on her merits. The son of a well-to-do French lawyer who had lived for a time at the court of a duchess was doubtless a man of much greater refinement than Luther, the son of Saxon peasants. Though shy and reserved, he could be a charming companion and had many and deeply-attached friends.

It may seem paradoxical to describe Calvin as a liberal. There were, however, two important issues on which he definitely took the liberal side. In the first place he was thoroughly opposed to the imposition of creeds on the clergy. Though his opinions on the Trinity seem to have been perfectly orthodox according to conciliar standards, he refused to give a formal assent to the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian Creeds (p. 63).

> 'For him the Word of God, not the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, was the compelling authority for faith. "We have sworn the faith in the one God, not in Athanasius, whose Creed no true Church has ever approved." . . . The faith ought not to be tied to mere words or syllables.'

Secondly, although he had convinced himself and many others

that the Presbyterian system may be traced back to the New Testament, and though he would have tolerated, of course, no rival Church in Geneva, he was too much of a statesman to wish to impose it everywhere.

> 'While combating the claim of the Pope and the hierarchy to divine jurisdiction over the Church, he was ready to recognize, as in the case of the English Church, the patriarchal and episcopal system of government as suitable for a large kingdom.'

He had no sympathy with the fussy scrupulosity of the English Puritans. He was in favour of a sort of federation of the Protestant Churches, including of course Anglicans and Lutherans, and would have welcomed the assembly of a General Council of Protestants as a counterblast to that of Trent.

How does Calvinism stand in the Europe of to-day? Dr. Mackinnon thus sums up the situation.

> 'We hear in books and conferences of a Calvinist Revival. But even among the votaries of orthodox Calvinism there is perforce some reservation in regard to certain aspects of his thought and practice, which the modern world, to the advantage of Christianity, has outlived. Whilst the neo-Calvinism of Karl Barth and his school, with its insistence on the sovereignty of God and the Word of God as the revelation of His will, has evoked a widespread interest, it is not a return to Calvinism pure and simple, if the tone of its founder is dogmatic enough. A literal Calvinist Revival is neither possible nor desirable, though the Reformed Churches may be trusted to appreciate and preserve what is of permanent interest, abiding value in his thought and work.'

GAMALIEL MILNER.

IN MEMORIAM

ARTHUR EDWARD BURDEKIN, 1860—1937.

Arthur Edward Burdekin's life as a clergyman was characterized by an earnest desire to learn the truth and to teach the truth. He came of a north country family, without special Church influences. His father was a lawyer of distinction at Sheffield, who destined his son to follow in the same profession. Ultimately, the Law was given up, and Burdekin went up to St. John's, Oxford, at the age of 27.

Ordination followed, with two curacies in Yorkshire, and it was this experience which opened his eyes to what he believed to be weaknesses in ministerial teaching. Why did he not then take up town work with its wider openings? There seem to be two reasons for this: first, his health

was never robust enough to meet the physical strain: and secondly, his natural modesty made him shy of entering into possible conflict with town colleagues on burning questions of faith.

He accepted as his first cure the rectory of West Woodhay, a tiny village in Berkshire, and was there for nine years. Then for four years he held a College living at Fyfield, possibly attracted by nearness to Oxford. In 1918 Bishop Paget presented him to a spreading country parish at Cranborne in Windsor Forest, where he laboured for fifteen years, and won the hearts of rich and poor, boldly preaching a Liberal Christianity, and the right place for tradition. Here he was single-handed all through the War, carrying consolation into homes where sorrow and bereavement were the lot of so many. But the work, with no clerical help, was a strain to his health, and in 1925 he returned to West Woodhay for the last ten years of his ministry.

To a friend, who knew him intimately in latter years, Burdekin confessed that he had failed to impress his brother-clergy with the essentials of Liberal faith, and that his neighbours' pulpits were therefore closed to him. This friend would here acknowledge, with humble gratitude, that to Burdekin he owes the great discovery that Christianity is a Life and not a Creed.

For many years Burdekin compiled, as a labour of love, the indices to the annual volumes of the *Modern Churchman*. This was typical of his life's work: he desired neither payment nor publicity for his services.

P.W.

BOOK REVIEWS

GUIGNEBERT'S JESUS*

Professor Guignebert possesses a lucid and persuasive style, which suffers no detraction in Professor Hooke's admirable translation of his book on the life and teaching of Jesus.* His learning is profound, but he wears the mantle of the scholar with such easy grace that any person of ordinary education can read him with pleasure. His book will, no doubt, have a wide circulation, and will exercise an influence in circles to which the writings of theologians do not usually penetrate.

The intelligent public, even that large section which makes no claim to belong to the *intelligentsia*, is aware that criticism has long been at work on the Gospels. It wants to know what, in the process, has been destroyed, what remains, and what must be regarded as doubtful. This kind of question is legitimate, and the enquiring layman has a right to demand a straight answer. The student may seek an answer in the writings of our

* *Jesus.* By Ch. Guignebert, Professor of the History of Christianity in the Sorbonne. Translated from the French by S. H. Hooke, Samuel Davidson Professor of Old Testament Studies in the University of London. (Published, 1935, by Kegan Paul and Co., Ltd. Price 25/-.)

English biblical scholars, but even biblical scholars are sometimes prone to evasion. If one may be allowed to parody a parody, it is true that

> Commentators oft remind us
> We may shroud our facts in mist,
> And transmute them to the purpose
> Of the deft apologist.

There is no mistiness about Professor Guignebert. In his book he gives the impression of entire frankness and honesty. Unfortunately, though English biblical critics may be equally honest, they do not invariably give the same impression of frankness. The reader senses a theological *arrière pensée*, which, he suspects, prohibits free expression of the critical judgment. If the critic uses the methods of *Formgeschichte*, he is apt to blur the distinction between what Jesus said and did, and what the early Church taught and imagined. He confuses the Jesus of History with the Spirit of Jesus and this again with the 'mind' of the primitive Christian community. If the critic be theologically under the influence of Karl Barth, his addition to the Barthian smoke-screen does not lessen the fuzziness of his pronouncements. When asked a straightforward question he evades it by slipping discreetly from the plane of history into that of theology. However skilfully he performs this manoeuvre, his very dexterity prejudices the reader's confidence in him.

The unsophisticated reader wonders, for example, whether the prayer of our Lord in the Garden of Gethsemane is authentic or not. He turns to Guignebert and is told frankly that the words put in the mouth of Jesus by Mark are as much a dramatisation of the situation as the incidents introduced by Luke, the angelic ministration and the bloody sweat. 'From the critical point of view, no evidence for this prayer exists, since there is no one at Jesus' side to hear it, and Peter and James, who are not far away, are asleep.' Guignebert may be right or wrong, but he has given a straight answer and has stated his reasons for it. If, on the other hand, the enquirer turns to the distinguished English critic, Dr. Rawlinson, whose commentary on St. Mark's Gospel deservedly stands in high repute among scholars, this is the reply he receives: 'The critics who have somewhat prosaically asked how the disciples could have known what our Lord was praying when He was away from them, or when they were asleep, are well answered by H. G. Wood, who remarks that if the disciples "were not physically close enough to Jesus to hear the words of His prayer, then, later, they must have been spiritually close enough to Him to interpret the scene aright."' Mr. Wood gives, in effect, the same answer as Guignebert. The prayer is a dramatisation of the scene. Dr. Rawlinson seems to be of the same opinion, but with considerable adroitness he evades saying so explicitly. Nor will his half sneer at the somewhat prosaic character of the question reassure the simple enquirer.

It will be only ruefully that many will make the admission, but it must be admitted that the patent frankness of Professor Guignebert's book added to its erudition will give it a wide influence. It is futile for those who

deplore this to complain. They should rather seek themselves to display the same admirable qualities. The Group Movement emphasizes the necessity of Absolute Honesty. It would be well if its teaching, at any rate in this respect, were taken to heart at the present moment by all who are concerned in the Recall to Religion. Any such recall will fall on deaf ears unless even the most scrupulous are convinced that the Church is fearlessly and unreservedly loyal to truth in matters of biblical criticism as well as elsewhere.

Though the general public may not know it, the student is well aware that competent English scholars go quite a long way with Guignebert on the road of radical criticism. Thus Guignebert says of the Temptation in the Wilderness:

> 'The incident of the temptation is completely legendary, and each of our three Synoptists has embroidered the main theme as he saw fit. The accounts of Matthew and Luke are sheer hagiographical imagination.'

The distinguished English critic, Professor Creed, in his commentary on St. Luke's Gospel, goes almost as far. He writes:

> 'It seems likely that the picture as given in Q has been filled in by the imagination of the early Church. The balanced structure of the three temptations with the three quotations of Scripture in reply suggests a reflective dramatization of the rejection by Jesus of false Messianic ideals . . . The Gospel narrative is not improbably designed to distinguish the claims and character of Jesus Christ from those of such false Christs and false prophets [as Simon Magus].'

Again, of the Lucan account of the appearance of Jesus before Herod after His examination by Pilate, Guignebert says: 'This is an addition which is peculiar to the third Evangelist, and whose futility does him scant credit. It is a piece of pure hagiography.' Professor Creed suggests that the origin of the story may perhaps be traced to the reference to 'the kings of the earth' and 'the rulers' in *Psalm* ii as quoted in *Acts* iv, 25*f.*, where the kings and rulers are identified with Herod and Pilate.

> 'If the story rested on early tradition, it is strange that it should not appear in Mark. Moreover it does not seem likely that Pilate would send a political prisoner to be tried by Antipas within his own jurisdiction.'

However, though to his loss, the layman who is quite likely to read Professor Guignebert's book is not at all likely to read such a book as Professor Creed's *Commentary on St. Luke*. He is quite unaware that with judicious and a reasonable caution many of our great scholars combine courage and frankness in a high degree. The books which come into his hands are, for the most part, marked by a reticence which the charitable may ascribe to reverence, but which the general reader will incline to attribute to timidity or to theological *parti pris*. Of one of such books, Bishop Headlam's *Life and Teaching of Jesus*, Professor Guignebert has no high opinion. 'This author,' he remarks, 'has a capacity for confidence in the gospel texts which is only equalled by his critical incompetence.'

There is little doubt that the layman who feels that the writers whose books on Jesus and the Gospels come his way blur their conclusions, even, he suspects, deliberately, will tend, in reaction, to be swept off his feet by Guignebert. This would be a pity. Guignebert's sweeping generalizations are sometimes more brilliant than sound, and they need to be checked by a more cautious, a more pedestrian type of criticism.

Guignebert considers that our *Mark* cannot be dated earlier than A.D. 70. *Matthew* he puts at about A.D. 85 to 90, and *Luke* as late as the first decade of the second century. *Mark* he regards as a composite work, 'not a source, but a basin into which several sources flow.' He dates Q and *Ur-Marcus*, the earliest written sources, about A.D. 50. During the preceding twenty years the apostolic reminiscences were in circulation as oral tradition. He admits that it is reasonable to assume that the Apostles to a certain extent, but only to a certain extent, resisted the forces which tended to make them lose contact with the historical facts of the ministry of Jesus. Their disciples, however, would not feel the same restraint. Our Gospels 'were written to serve the purposes of instruction, of controversial apologetic, and of organized worship.'

> 'Either tendentious legend or subsequent invention, this is the verdict that perpetually recurs when we are reviewing the incidents which the Synoptic tradition has bequeathed to us.'

Guignebert repeatedly and emphatically stresses what he calls the influence of hagiography on the Gospel tradition. No doubt it was considerable, but if it was as unrestrained as he holds, surely the tradition would have developed much more luxuriantly along hagiographical lines than it did during the forty years which according to Guignebert preceded the completion of our *Mark*. Hagiography, when given its head, speedily gallops away from all touch with reality. An unbiassed reading of St. Mark's Gospel suggests that, though hagiographical influence must be admitted, fancy was not as free from control by fact as Guignebert would have us believe.

One of Guignebert's compatriots has said that to question the reality of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus is to reduce the history of the origins of Christianity to 'a heap of absurdities, a tissue of contradiction.' Guignebert, on the contrary, maintains that Jesus never thought of Himself as the Messiah. The Messianic interpretation of the Person of Jesus came to birth as a result of the Resurrection faith and was bred of the reflection of the early believers. He concludes a discussion of the alleged Messianic consciousness of Jesus by recalling two facts:

> 'The first is that Jesus is never reported to have said, "I am the Messiah; I bring you the Kingdom," and, if he believed it, there seems no reason why he should not have done so. The second is that at the end of the Last Supper (*Mark* xiv, 25), when he announces the Messianic feast to the Apostles, he does not say that there is a place of honour there for him. . . . There can be no question, therefore, that

> in Jesus we are dealing with a prophet, a herald of the expected Kingdom.'

But we cannot have it both ways. Whether or not Jesus believed that He was the Messiah, His followers, after the Resurrection, most certainly did. If the kind of influence which Guignebert calls hagiographical was anything like as powerful as he holds, it is incredible that the Gospels could provide the evidence which he adduces *against* the possession by Jesus of a Messianic consciousness.

Guignebert does not rate Form Criticism which 'endeavours, by means of the analysis of the existing text, to get back to the period prior to the setting down of the tradition' as highly as do some of its ingenious practitioners. The conclusions to which it leads are not all equally convincing. It however has its uses as a special and somewhat limited application of the historical method. It is 'the historical method itself which remains, on the whole, our sole hope, when textual and philological criticism has said its last word.' In this he agrees with Goguel, who thinks that the *Formgeschichtliche Schule* is 'less original than it believes itself to be, and than it says it is.' Those who seek to understand the development of the Gospel tradition by having recourse to the influence of cultus

> 'try to explain something which is imperfectly known by something which is absolutely unknown, for we know nothing at all about the form of Christian worship which was in use at the time when the Gospels were composed.'

Professor Guignebert's book is bound to have a wide influence. It will bring to the man who has had no academic training the results of academic biblical scholarship in a very readable form. And he will read it and be influenced by it. Those who deplore the kind of influence it will have will not better the position by deprecating academic scholarship and suggesting that we should turn our interest elsewhere. They should rather follow the example of the French Professor, and, with the same single-minded devotion to truth, themselves strive to make the fruits of the best scholarship as widely available as it may be. Professor Guignebert has shown us how to do it.

G. L. H. Harvey.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP *

It is no doubt true that reformers are blind in one eye. All intense concentration narrows the field of vision, and it seems to be beyond the power of man to be both devoted and detached, resolute for change, yet sympathetic to tradition, a prophet and also a mystic. This unfortunate limitation should teach us all humility. We know that in this history of human institutions the pendulum swings from one extreme to the other, and that neither extreme represents the truth. But we know also that if the pendulum did

* *Worship.* Evelyn Underhill. (Library of Constructive Theology: Nisbet and Co., London. 1936.)

not swing, the clock would stop; there would be no history to record. Just as it is the tension between the momentum of the pendulum and the pull towards its point of rest that keeps the clock going, so it is the balance between reforming zeal and tradition that allows institutions to live and grow, yet remain true to the inner principles which they conserve; for if reforming zeal without tradition would be chaos, tradition without reforming zeal would be death. We need not deny that the prophets were perhaps a little too sweeping in their denunciation of the sacrificial system; that they were blind to the rich meaning which the ancient cult held for the spiritually discerning. But they did denounce it; and paradoxically enough it was *they* who allowed us to see what the old religion really meant, and to what is pointed. Similarly, we have been taught that Pharisaism was not the sterile dead thing that we had supposed — not, that is, for those who were able to penetrate to its core. Yet Jesus used no half-measures in His dealings with the Pharisees; and again it is just because of His ruthless clearing away of the unessential hard shell that we have been able to discern the living kernel within.

The ardent Modernist who reads this book will find it necessary to keep a resolute hold of these obvious commonplaces, or he will find all his contempt for 'Romish superstitions,' all his scorn for the dabblers in incense, bells, lights, images, monstrances and the whole furnishings of popular Catholicism, all his eagerness for services 'suited to our modern needs' melting away like the morning frost in the warmth of its charity and the glow of the deep understanding with which it illuminates and sanctifies all that it touches. Miss Evelyn Underhill's aim has been to give an account of the origins and varieties of Christian Worship which shall not describe the forms it has taken as so many lifeless formulae to be compared and dissected, but as, even in their most naïve and errant shapes, means whereby man has reached out after God, and God's love has entered and refreshed the soul of man. It is an aim finely conceived and finely carried out. It has called for great gifts of understanding and charity, for, as Miss Underhill most truly says:

> 'No ritual pattern can be understood by us, until we have penetrated below its surface and observed the spiritual realities which it embodies and seeks to express. Many absurd things have been written about traditional Christian worship by those who failed to realize this simple truth' (p. 244).

So we see passed in review the liturgical forms which have expressed the religious aspirations of Jewish Worship, Eastern and Western Catholicism, Presbyterianism, Free Church and Quaker Worship. The aim is to show in each case how it strikes a believer; and the grave beauty of the writing never allows the reader to forget that he is treading on holy ground. This, one feels, is the only attitude in which the problems of Christian reunion can be profitably approached; indeed, the book might be taken as a valuable excursus upon a notable paragraph from the Bishop of Gloucester's

recent letter to the *Times* dealing with Eucharistic Belief. His Lordship says:

> 'I wish I could persuade Mr. Bowring and the Church generally to approach the question of Eucharistic Belief from the point of view, not of theological or controversial definitions, but of religious values' (*Times*, January 22nd).

It is the 'religious values' which are here emphasized. Miss Underhill shows that the spirit of worship must find for itself a body, 'a costly and explicit embodiment,' without which it will remain 'thin, abstract, and notional: a tendency, an attitude, a general aspiration, moving alongside human life, rather than in it' (p. 14). The process of embodiment carries with it losses and dangers. Yet no vital form of worship has entirely lost the power of putting the human soul in touch with the Divine. And this fact is to be gladly recognized:

> 'It is surely mere arrogance to insist that with angels and archangels we laud and magnify the Holy Name, whilst disdaining the shaggy companions who come with us to the altar of faith: having already, indeed, discerned that altar in a darkness which we have left behind, and given costly offerings to the unknown God whom we so coldly serve' (p. 21).

So, in a spirit of generous sympathy, one is led to see the value of an *ex opere operato* theory of the sacraments:

> 'In the genuine sacrament, this action and this penetration (*i.e.* of the Eternal into the Temporal) must be so complete, so entirely independent of the worshipper's uneven religious sensibility, that here men can be sure of laying hold of a spiritual reality truly present in its own right; awaiting their recognition, but in no way conditioned by it' (p. 46).

Of the Eucharist as a sacrifice:

> 'The Christian Eucharist lifts up to heavenly places that willing self-offering of the creature under sensible signs which is the essence of sacrificial worship' (p. 149).

Of the worship of the Virgin and the Saints:

> 'This cultus is, in origin, an acknowledgment of the corporate and totalitarian character of the Christian response to God, a confident appeal from the struggling members of the family to those who have achieved stability and peace. Further, the Catholic Christian finds and adores God's self-disclosure, not only at its focal point, but also in its total spreading radiance' (p. 251).

Of the worship of the reserved sacrament:

> 'This devotion has proved its worth as a carrying-medium of the Supernatural, and an incitement to prayer; providing a focus of worship, a concrete and visible pledge of the invisible Presence, which can be appreciated by the most simple, yet can satisfy the needs of the deepest soul' (p. 257).

These are extreme examples, and it must not be supposed that Miss Underhill has any particular bias in favour of these forms of worship, or that she is not aware of the abuses to which they may give rise. They illustrate

only her desire to bring out that which is valuable in all the forms which Christian devotion has taken.

It is well that we should be taught that our hasty condemnation of the religious practices of others may be as blind and unintelligent as is the secularist's condemnation of all religious practices. Yet is there not a danger of carrying sympathy too far? Is there no point at which we are in danger of toppling over into the abyss where the distinction between truth and falsehood is obscured? One remembers Johnson's rebuke to Boswell for what he considered an exercise of misplaced sympathy: 'Sir, never accustom yourself to confuse right and wrong!' We may well admit that 'The response of a creature conditioned by time and space to a timeless and spaceless Reality will have characters which constantly break the bounds of philosophy and of logic' (p. 173). We know full well that a liturgy, like poetry, 'means' more than its logical content expresses, and is not understood when this over-plus of meaning is not felt.

> The man that looks on glass,
> On it may stay his eye;
> Or if he pleases, through it pass,
> And then the Heavens espy.

Yet the windows through which all worshippers must look are of different degrees of transparency; and some may even face in the wrong direction. No doubt the reserved sacrament can be all that Miss Underhill says; but how much more it can be! The point is that, where it is used, it is used to the exclusion of other legitimate channels of Grace, and it has equally certainly given rise to abuses which are only too well known. Can we not preserve its values without its dangers? Or again, it is all very well to speak of the appropriateness and charm of appeals to the Saints. But we are forced to ask ourselves whether in point of fact they can do what God cannot; whether their worship has not rather shifted devotion from its true focal point than helped it to centre there. We are glad to have been reminded that among the values of common worship is that it teaches humility, allowing the spiritually advanced to tolerate and share means of religious expression which are valuable for the spiritual beginners. We do well to remember that 'the Church is not a collection of prize specimens, but a flock' (p. 98). But this argument can be, and is in this book, reversed. For we are told elsewhere, with equal truth, that:

> 'The Saints, moving easily within the great Catholic system, had never lost contact with those living truths. But as far as the mass of believers was concerned, they had been buried under the ceremonial system which was designed to give them ritual expression.'

To strike the right balance is, of course, the whole problem of public worship. How far is one to go in accommodation to the needs of elementary capacities? We are all children in our apprehension of absolute truth, and pitifully limited in our spiritual reach; yet degrees of understanding do exist, and are not entirely without significance. We are all tied to ritual,

symbol, and sacrament, and our personal worship is muddied with the limitations of our creatureliness; yet it remains true that some symbols lead the soul onwards, while others enchain it. The test can only be that of average suitability and average effectiveness in leading men to God. In this matter it is true that the accumulated experience of generations of Christians cannot be despised. No one who has thought his way to the inside of, for example, our English services will be anxious lightly to cast them away. After all, no 'common prayer' can be more than a compromise; it cannot, and is not intended to furnish all that is necessary for the devotional life of a Christian. It is an important aspect of that life. But behind the 'common prayer,' giving it particular application, and filling out its large inclusiveness with the day-to-day needs of the individual self is always assumed to be the life of personal prayer, without which any imaginable pattern of corporate prayer must quickly become an empty formality.

> 'All the great masters of worship insist on the importance of the secret personal life of adoration as "the first essential for a Christian"; the only condition under which he can hope to become a channel of the Divine Charity, and co-operate in the sanctification of life. For it is the self-oblivious gaze, the patient and disciplined attention to God, which deepens understanding, nourishes humility and love; and by the gentle processes of growth gradually brings the creature into that perfect dedication to His purpose which is the essence of the worshipping life' (p. 165).

R. J. STANFORD.

ASTRONOMY AND PRESENT DAY BELIEFS*

In this volume the President of the British Astronomical Association, a clergyman in the East End of London and a well-known amateur astronomer, draws attention to the ground that the churches have lost and are daily losing through their failure to adopt the outlook on the Universe which is common to all educated men and women. In the language of their creeds and their hymns and only too often in their teaching they still go back four hundred years to pre-Copernican days, and they wonder sadly why people are drifting steadily away from the Church. In his chapter on the stellar universe Dr. Davidson suggests that recent knowledge of the immense scale of the Universe must inevitably widen the gap between the thoughtful student and the older teaching of the Church:

> 'We must be ready to approach the problem of the insignificance of our planet in the Universe with an unbiassed mind, and to enquire whether it has any bearing on the Christian scheme, and if so, in what way it suggests the necessity for some modification in our views of revelation.'

In a Newton, a Darwin or an Einstein, in one who changes the scientific outlook by introducing some new and fertile idea, science does not

* *The Heavens and Faith.* By Rev. M. Davidson, D.Sc., F.R.A.S. (Watts and Co. 1936. 5/-.)

find reason for deploring its lost faith. Theology must learn from science something of her confident, forward-looking hope, even though the theologians at the same time have to stiffen their sense of criticism in testing what new beliefs may be offered to them.

In his astronomical and scientific discussions Dr. Davidson is on the sure ground of knowledge. In the later chapters of his book he moves on to the much more difficult question of the finality of the Christian ethic. Here he frankly faces up to the problem whether the limitations of Christ's knowledge imposed by His humanity apply not only to the facts of nature but to His ethical and religious teaching. The need to apply the spirit of His teaching to modern problems rather than to settle them by too literal an application of the words of the New Testament is clamant. The failure of the Churches to modernize the Christian ethic is another of the factors weakening the body politic of Christendom.

Dr. Davidson recognizes that his book must offend many Christians. On the other hand, he hopes that others who are repelled by the dogmas of Christianity may be helped to

> 'appreciate the important fact that certain things considered by some to be essential to Christianity are not fundamental.'

He hopes to help in forming a synthesis

> 'between those who recognize no Divine Revelation and those who would find life utterly irrational without a belief in such.'

Sir Frank Dyson, the late Astronomer Royal, in a foreword which he has contributed to the book sums this point up as follows:

> 'His book should appeal to those Christians who can devoutly say the General Confession and the Lord's Prayer, but cannot recite the Creeds, or can do so only with mental reservation.'

F.J.M.S.

DIVINE HUMANITY *

Dr. Lowther Clarke is a scholar who reads widely and who thinks independently. In this book he presents eleven essays and eight short notes on a variety of subjects connected with the criticism and interpretation of the New Testament. They are characterized by an originality of treatment which makes them fresh and interesting, even though it sometimes verges on the whimsical. The author's position is difficult to criticise because, although he is obviously familiar with modern biblical studies, and seems to grant critical premises without reserve, he yet displays a tendency to treat particular problems from a standpoint which is almost precritical. Thus he will quote the words of Jesus as though criticism had thrown no doubt on the reliability of the Gospel records; and indeed he declares in the preface his method:

> 'The terrible complication of the Synoptic Problem, which causes

* *Divine Humanity.* Doctrinal Essays on New Testament Problems. By W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 5/-.)

> some to despair of finding the real Jesus, has led me to try the experiment of seeing what happens if certain passages are taken as practically verbatim reports of His words.'

If this method is to be approved, then indeed many generations of scholars have laboured in vain.

The first essay on 'The Clouds of Heaven' is one of the most challenging, for the author, after examining two contrasted types of eschatological expectation current among the Jews, and having reviewed a number of eschatological passages in the New Testament, concludes that Christ did not teach a second coming *to earth*, and that the earliest Christians did not expect an earthly kingdom to be set up. This involves a good deal of bold exegesis, and one doubts whether the method of approach is the right one. In view of all we know about the influence of early Christian ideas upon the Gospel records the starting-point should surely be the hopes of the first century as exemplified, for instance in the Pauline Epistles; then we may be able to judge what the words of the Gospels meant to those who wrote and read them. In no connexion is it more dangerous to make the author's assumption that

> 'the words ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels come substantially from His lips, except in so far as variations in the parallel accounts compel a different conclusion.'

The obsession of the early believers with thoughts of the Parousia must inevitably have influenced the selection and editing of the sayings of Jesus, and a comparison of the several Gospels shows the extent to which this was done. Dr. Clarke admits that before long the later form of the eschatological hope prevailed, and that 'the *return* of the Messiah to earth was expected.' But he thinks there is sufficient evidence that the earlier hope was that the elect would be caught up into heaven to reign with the Lord Jesus.

> 'Judgment was committed to the Son of Man who would exercise it in heaven, where His throne was set. Then a new heaven and a new earth would be created.'

It may be questioned whether amid so much that was vague the clear distinction between these two views can be justified. Both are equally fantastic to the modern mind.

The second essay on 'The Route of the Magi' is one of the most original and interesting. The author believes that St. Matthew's story of the wise men is not intended to illustrate the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, but is inserted to typify the surrender of the exponents of heathen magic to Christ. This theme is well supported by quotation and argument. Of the other essays, that on John the Baptist is a useful summary, even though it contains little that is new. A thoughtful essay on the Temptations opposes extreme views and argues that the narrative is derived from the teaching of Jesus Himself. The fifth essay on 'What is the Gospel?' invites comparison with the recent conclusions of Professor Dodd on the

character of the Apostolic *kerygma*.

> 'The Gospel,' says Dr. Clarke, 'is the Kingdom of God, the message which is also the reality, that God has ascended the throne and the New Age has begun.'

In other words, the Gospel was a message of 'realized eschatology.' It is an important conclusion.

The most difficult essay in the book, and perhaps the least satisfactory, is that on 'The Mode of the Divine Indwelling.' The problem is approached, strangely enough, through Mr. J. W. Dunne's *Experiment with Time*, and the method does not help to simplify the problem. Equally whimsical is the approach in the next essay, 'A Sense of the Past, a Christological Speculation,' which is founded on a novel of Henry James. The next essay, 'Yet without Sin,' starts from Mrs. Skrine's novel *Shepherd Easton's Daughter*. The essay on 'The Church of God' is more suggestive, but it too becomes a little fanciful towards the end. The treatment of the Atonement will seem to some readers to depend on some strange ideas.

The final chapter contains interesting and valuable notes on a variety of subjects, French Theologians, 'The dead are raised up' (wherein the Gospel miracles are explained on a theory of suspended animation), the perpetual virginity of Mary, and others.

Dr. Lowther Clarke displays great learning, and his essays abound in quotations both from the Scriptures and from the Fathers, but one lays down the book with a feeling that his judgment is not always equal to his ingenuity. The thought is often elusive, ecclesiastical influences sometimes predominate, and irrationalism slips in from time to time. What, for instance, are we to make of the statement on p. 173 that 'Jesus made the Cross sacrificial and prevailing for others by His offering of the separated Body and Blood in the Upper Room'?

P. GARDNER-SMITH.

PATRISTIC THEOLOGICAL SPECULATION*

Blaise Pascal—pietist and sceptic—asked: 'Who of us believes in that little word God?' Probably each of us does, at least in certain circumstances, but how few of us realize how much his own conception of God differs from everyone else's conception of the Deity. The term God covers an infinite variety of meanings even within the sphere of the Christian religion. Dr. Prestige, perhaps the most brilliant writer of the Anglo-Catholic school, and one of its most accomplished scholars, has done a useful service by producing his volume, *God in Patristic Thought*. His book, as the title indicates, does not deal with the conceptions of God in the minds of simple Christians but with the idea of God as expounded by the authoritative teachers of the Christian Church. But here also the range of the subject is strictly limited. Dr. Prestige has confined his exposition to the views of the Greek Fathers ranging from St. Ignatius

* *God in Patristic Thought*. By G. L. Prestige, D.D. (Heinemann. 12/6. 1936.)

down to the Damascene with comparative glances at their Latin contemporaries. Though less brilliant than *The Influence of Greek Ideas upon Christian Thought* by Edwin Hatch, and less attractive in style than *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* by Charles Bigg, Dr. Prestige's volume deserves to take its place beside the modern studies of patristic doctrine which we owe to Rashdall, Gwatkin, Bethune-Baker, Ottley, Moberley, and Raven.

The theme with which Dr. Prestige deals, instead of being described as the rise, development and consummation of Greek patristic theology might as appropriately be named the Hellenistic rationalization of the primitive Christian religion. There was loss as well as gain in this process. Adolf von Harnack, the most erudite of all modern students of Christian dogmatics, regarded the process as one of 'secularisation,' and our own Edwin Hatch did the same. Yet reason has its place in the Christian religion, and for Thomas Aquinas, as for Hastings Rashdall, the place of reason is supreme: for the mystics it is otherwise.

The Christian Church in the second century found itself possessed of a Divine Revelation contained in the Old and the New Testaments. The Old Testament teaching about God, the Father, was full of crude anthropomorphisms and the New Testament teaching about God, the Son, was also hampered by similar difficulties for philosophic theology. In translating the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, the Septuagint translators had done their best to tone down these anthropomorphisms, and Philo, the greatest of the Jewish exegetes of the Old Testament, by means of the allegorical method of interpretation, had even succeeded in eliminating these anthropomorphisms altogether. The Greek Fathers, in their endeavour to eliminate anthropomorphisms from the Christian doctrine of God were thus only carrying forward a process which Greek culture had forced the Judaism of Alexandria to initiate. If the world of Greek and Roman culture was to be won for the Christian religion such a process was necessary. In the end the Christian Church became possessed in its Chalcedonian Confession of a Theology which presented in a co-ordinated system of thought the Trinity in Unity: the Divine Father, the Divine Son and the Divine Spirit of the Scriptures: but oh, how changed, and for plain men and women, how incomprehensible!

A great Egyptian theologian of the Thebaid was informed that one of his monks held and was proclaiming crude anthropomorphic views of God. He set out at once to investigate the matter and found the report to be only too true. Immediately he set about converting the victim of these theological crudities, and he succeeded. The victim confessed that the arguments of his opponent had made it impossible for him to hold an anthropomorphic view of God, but added he: 'In depriving me of my belief in God, as a man, you have deprived me of my belief in God, altogether.'

When carried through to its logical conclusion, the rationalization of the Christian religion leaves us with only, what Dean Mansel described as

'a regulative knowledge of God'—a conclusion which infuriated almost to madness the prophetic Christian consciousness of F. D. Maurice. The late Dr. R. B. Tollinton in his admirable, but too little known, book *Alexandrine Teaching on the Universe*[1] in dealing with the crucial question of the impassibility of God stresses this danger.

> 'In one important item Hellenism in its extreme phases is difficult to reconcile with the Christian religion. For in the philosophic doctrine of God there is no place for anything anthropomorphic. God is not liable to *pathos*, while man is constantly so affected. In the One of Plotinus it is difficult to find room for anything like emotion. We must not say God feels. Yet probably the only ground for Christian teaching on the love and fatherhood of God is really anthropomorphic in character. . . . If we may not take the highest of all our nature's assets, if we may not argue from the highest in man to the nature of the divine, from the derived to its source, then it is difficult to see on what basis of reason we claim the right to speak of the love of God. But to argue from man's nature to God's is anthropomorphism. It is the method of both the Old and New Testaments. . . .
>
> 'The highest element in human nature is taken to have its counterpart in the divine. The doctrine of the Incarnation would indeed be difficult if we might not hold a certain natural affinity between the best in man and the character of God. If our thoughts of God are to have meaning and validity they must inevitably be fashioned by our experience. We take the highest experience given to us. Something to account for this, something not essentially alien from this, must exist, we claim, in the divine nature. Let us again admit that such a method of argument is anthropomorphic. I do not know how without it we are to find substantial ground for a belief in the love of God, unless we simply accept this on the absolute authority of Jesus Christ. Equally I do not know how you are to find place for such a divine fatherhood in that transcendent remote and isolated deity which is left us, when the method of abstraction has fulfilled its task unto the end' (p. 39 f.).

Although there are great dangers and possibly great losses to be incurred in this process of Hellenistic rationalising of the Christian religion, yet the study of this process is essential to the understanding of Christian theology. In the end the process endowed the Church with a logically irrefragible but popularly incomprehensible theology. As a consequence, Barbarian Arianism, Latin Tritheism and Islamic Deism, largely replaced the Gospel of Galilee.

As we study the process once again so brilliantly presented in its stages and in its aberrations by Dr. Prestige, we are compelled to recognize that it is often little more than chop-logic and word-play. The theological distinctions do not correspond in many cases with either divine or human realities. This is conspicuously evident in the ingenious theory of the circumincessio which we owe to the Pseudo-Cyril.

The most valuable contribution made by this volume to the study of dogmatic theology is concerned with the doctrine of the Unity in Trinity

[1] Allen & Unwin. 1932. 5/-.

and the Trinity in Unity. Dr. Prestige points out and it is best to cite his own words that:

> 'it appears that the long history of the evolution of Trinitarian doctrine . . . is the record of a long struggle, in the face of heresy, to express and explain, consonantly with the retention of the facts of experience, the true unity of God. By a full use of the subtlety of Greek thought and language, it was laid down that God is a single objective Being in three objects of presentation. This may be paraphrased in the expression, already employed, that He is one object in Himself and three objects to Himself. Alternatively, the result of the extended theological process may be summed up, in language more modern than any used by a Greek Father, but in loyalty to the spirit and meaning of Greek theology, in the formula that in God there are three divine organs of God-consciousness, but one centre of divine self-consciousness. As seen and thought, He is three: as seeing and thinking, He is one. He is one eternal principle of life and light and love. Yet the life implies reproduction within the Trinitarian cycle of the divine being: the light is reflected in a social order of morality: and the love is embodied in a genuinely mutual activity. To claim more is perilous to Christian monotheism. To claim less is treacherous to Christian History' (p. 300 f.).

This is a conclusion which will be valued by modernist theologians and we believe that it is one which is supported by a proper understanding of St. Thomas Aquinas who affirmed that God was one mind (*una mens*).

'The ablest minds may be the narrowest,' writes Dr. Prestige, and certainly this appears to be the case when we study some of the acutest of our Christian dogmatists.

On the platform of the Oxford Railway Station a notable Dean was standing with a companion, and a former head of Pusey House was walking up and down in front of them. The Dean's companion remarked: 'He is the most learned patristic scholar in England: what he does not know about patristic theology is not worth knowing.' To which the Dean replied: 'Perhaps the same may be said of what he does know.'

To the Christian Mystic dogmatic theology is foolishness. It is not by the exercise of the logical faculty but by obedience to our moral consciousness and to our spiritual intuitions that we come to know God. It was St. Ambrose who said: 'It has not pleased God to save His people by dialectic.' There is a legend that St. Thomas Aquinas, having experienced the Beatific Vision, declined to complete the *Summa Theologiae*.

H.D.A.M.

AUTHORITATIVE ROMAN CATHOLIC MORALITY*

This standard book on Roman Catholic Morality is truly a monumental production, consisting of two tomes, of 786 and 1,029 pages. It claims to be a system of moral theology definitely based on the writings of St. Thomas, as is indicated by the references to the relevant portions of his

* *Summa Theologiae Moralis ad Mentem D. Thomae et ad Normam Juris Novi.* Edictit Benedictus Henricus Merkelbach, O.P. Editio Altera Recognita. Paris, Deodée de Brouwer. 1935.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC

writings at the head of the various sections. It is immensely learned, with numerous allusions to authors ancient and mediaeval and modern. It is issued with full commendation and imprimatur from the constituted Catholic authorities.

It is far too vast to admit of a compendious summary. But we may note the author's familiarity with modern ethical systems and tendencies, utilitarian, rationalistic, and others. In an appendix to the first volume he has a condensed but elaborate discussion of *utilitarismus evolutionisticus*, the ethics based on the theory of Darwin and elaborated by Herbert Spencer, with the kindred sociological ethics of Levy-Bruhl and Durkheim and the pragmatism of William James and Schiller.

In the second volume he deals with practical affairs under the heading of virtues, such as justice in its various forms, temperance, chastity, and the like. He goes into great detail concerning the legitimacy during abstinence of sundry articles of diet, such as margarine, Liebig's extract of meat, and gelatine, according as it is derived from fish or the bones of calves or flesh meat in general.

Ethical science does not appear to have made any very notable advance during the last two or three decades. Possibly it may be revitalised by means of a sympathetic consideration of the Thomistic system, which, because of its foundation on the principle of *beatitudo*, suggests the relating of the lesser temporal strivings of man for pleasure and happiness with the quest of the supreme joy of eternal life in God. For do we not need ethics at once practical and mundane and also idealistic and spiritual in the highest sense?

F. A. M. SPENCER.

'A BIBLE TO BE READ.'

This month the Bible Society is celebrating the fourth centenary of the first printed English version of the Scriptures. It hopes to revive a widespread practice of Bible reading and Bible study in English homes. Manifold difficulties beset the realization of this ideal, but there is no well-wisher of the English people who does not hope that such well-meant endeavours may secure success. One of the preliminary factors is supplied by well-printed Bibles of attractive *format*.

The Cambridge University Press has recently made a valuable contribution to this end. We heartily commend to lovers of the Authorized Version the half-crown Bible produced by the Syndics. Their six shilling Bible, beautifully bound but not in the conventional manner, is a most attractive volume. The Pitt Bible, printed on India paper with overlapping leather covers (12/-), is a beautiful example of the printer's and the bookbinder's art. The Cambridge University Press thus describes the special features of this new edition of the Bible:

> 'It is an attempt to produce a Bible, modern in typography and in binding, handy in size, but in type sufficiently large for easy reading—in fact, a Bible for the general reader—at prices from half-a-crown upwards.'

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION.

SIR,

In your reviewer's notice of Mr. Winter's book *The Church and the Boarding School* in the March *Modern Churchman,* a regret was expressed that some of the important problems mentioned by him were not dealt with in a recent conference of the National Society at Chester.

Since the Society became recognised under its new charter as the Central Council of the Church for Religious Education, the Higher Education Committee, in conjunction with the dioceses, has given considerable attention to some of these problems. A conference was arranged at Elfinsward in November, 1936, to consider ways in which the Church could offer her services to the Secondary Day School. One result has been that the Central Council is now co-operating with the Free Churches and the Institute of Christian Education on the question of the syllabus for the Secondary Schools. A conference was also held in February with the Incorporated Association of Preparatory Schools, and a joint committee has been set up to consider some of the recommendations in connection with school worship and the syllabus. Further, we are in close touch with the Teaching Church Group and the work it has been doing during these last years through its conferences with the boys and girls of Public Schools.

The conference at Chester, referred to in your letter, was arranged by the Sunday Education Committee for the purpose of considering in particular the problem of the religious education of the 'over-elevens.'

R. E. PARSONS.

National Society's Office,
19 Great Pier Street,
Westminster, S.W.1.
April 2nd, 1937.

THE RECENT RESIGNATIONS.

SIR,

There must be many of the younger lay members of the 'M.C.U.' who, like myself, are very greatly distressed by the recent resignations among those they have been accustomed to look to as their leaders. Reunion with the Church of Rumania—or any other Church—is of course an excellent thing, but Rumania is a long way off, and the recognition of that body means very little to the average Englishman. The crying need of to-day is to make religion a real and vital thing to ordinary men and women, and I suggest in all deference and humility, that that end will not be served so long as those who are better able to achieve it than any others, dissipate their energies in dispute about the theological difficulties of reunion with a distant communion.

RONA E. PARKER.

The White House,
Bassett Close,
Southampton.
March 31st, 1937.

'TOWARDS A NEW LITURGY.'

SIR,

Under the above heading the Rev. J. Harwood Little suggests an alteration in the 'comfortable words' in which he implies that the wording of the Authorised Version is 'Come unto me, ye weary, and I will give you rest.' These are the words of a sentimental hymn. The word 'weary' appears only once in the Gospels (A.V.) in the parable of the Unjust Judge. The A.V. in *Matt.* xi, 28, says: 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' This translation is obviously far inferior to that used in the 'Comfortable Words,' which, my Theological College notes tell me, are taken from *Herman's Consultation*; 'they are an independent translation not taken from any version of the scripture.' They are commended to us by their obvious common sense. Can we believe that when ever we have hard work to do we have only to go to Jesus and He will take away our labour and give us sweet rest? Surely the old form of this 'Comfortable Word' is grander by far and truly 'comfortable': 'Come unto me, all that *travail* and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you.' The word travail infers labouring in pain. It is common in the Old Testament and occurs occasionally in the New Testament (A.V.). Christ does not take the burden of labour from the back of the Christian, but He does give him the strength and refreshment to bear it and to do it, even as he did while he trod this earth.

C. N. SWAYNE.

Rye Bank, Broadhurst, Ashtead, Surrey.

March 19th, 1937.

CHRISTIAN ESSENTIALS AND NON-ESSENTIALS.

SIR,

I should be obliged if some of your readers would help me in my search for a small book describing in a *positive* way the essentials of our faith, and describing truly and briefly the non-essentials as evidenced by the particularities of our present different churches and denominations. The sort of book I want would perhaps best be seen if I say that it is wanted to put into the hands of educated Indians, so that they may learn of our modern religious and intellectual freedom, and not be confused by the apparently different religions presented to them as 'Christian.' One does not want books starting with the conflict of Science and Religion. One wants the attitude of searching for truth — of the necessity for which Science has recently reminded Religion — accepted from the start. If, as I rather fear, there is no such book printed, then, sir, may this letter serve to stimulate those qualified to write such a book, which as a missionary effort would assuredly reap a rich harvest not only in India but also in China, Japan and the Middle East.

H. H. KING.

Fairlawn, Beaconsfield.

March 16th, 1937.